BYZANTINE CAMEOS AND THE AESTHETICS OF THE ICON

by

James A. Magruder, III

A dissertation submitted to Johns Hopkins University in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Baltimore, Maryland
March 2014

Abstract

Byzantine icons have attracted artists and art historians to what they saw as the flat style of large painted panels. They tend to understand this flatness as a repudiation of the Classical priority to represent Nature and an affirmation of otherworldly spirituality. However, many extant sacred portraits from the Byzantine period were executed in relief in precious materials, such as gemstones, ivory or gold. Byzantine writers describe contemporary icons as lifelike, sometimes even coming to life with divine power. The question is what Byzantine Christians hoped to represent by crafting small icons in precious materials, specifically cameos.

The dissertation catalogs and analyzes Byzantine cameos from the end of Iconoclasm (843) until the fall of Constantinople (1453). They have not received comprehensive treatment before, but since they represent saints in iconic poses, they provide a good corpus of icons comparable to icons in other media. Their durability and the difficulty of reworking them also makes them a particularly faithful record of Byzantine priorities regarding the icon as a genre. In addition, the dissertation surveys theological texts that comment on or illustrate stone to understand what role the materiality of Byzantine cameos played in choosing stone relief for icons. Finally, it examines Byzantine epigrams written about or for icons to define the terms that shaped icon production.

The study finds that Byzantine cameos are exceptionally homogeneous: nearly all in relief, representing sacred persons against a blank ground, and typically cut in green stones. Where middle Byzantine cameos are most homogeneous, later Byzantine examples

show more variety of stone, color and style. While theological sources do not construct a symbolism of materials, they generally associate the Prophet Daniel's dream of a stone not cut by human hands with Christ's reign through the mediation of icons in precious materials. Byzantine poetry, on the other hand, emphasizes the icon as a renewal of Creation.

The dissertation concludes that Byzantine cameos were made not so much for personal protection as for public display of divine power. They reveal icons as traces of that presence in Creation, renewing humanity in the present age.

Advisor: Henry Maguire

Second Reader: Nino Zchomelidse

Preface

Because my research draws on a wide variety of sources in languages that are less familiar to Western scholars, I have avoided most abbreviations except for the standard American journal of Byzantine studies: DOP, that is Dumbarton Oaks Papers. J. P. Migne's Patrologia Graeca is abbreviated as PG and his Patrologia Latina as PL. The Clavis patrum graecorum is CPG. In transliterating Byzantine words and names, I have followed alphabetic rather than phonetic conventions and Anglicized universal Christian forenames, like Mary and John.

A vexing issue of terminology and thought in Byzantine art is the inflation of epithets for the Theotokos, several of which refer to icons kept in famous monasteries of Constantinople and which are used inconsistently both in the sources and modern literature. The most famous icon comes from the Blachernae Monastery, the Blachernitissa, which seems to have featured a full-length Theotokos orant. I have chosen to use Blachernitissa to refer to both full-length and bust portraits of the Theotokos with arms outstretched or in front of her body, as this seems to be the most consistent use of the term in Byzantine sources. Similarly we can understand the Hodegetria from the Monastery of the Hodegon district as an image of the Theotokos holding the Christ child in her left arm and pointing to him with her right hand. Because hodegoi means "guides," the gesture came to be associated with her gesture of pointing out the Christ and is an easy way to remember the type. A variant of her holding Him in her right arm is usually called the Dexiokratousa, literally right-handed holding. Another early iconography that emerged from the period of Iconoclasm featured the Theotokos holding a clipeated

portrait of the Pantokrator or Christ child and was often termed the Nikopoios or victory maker. By the twelfth century, bust-length images of the Theotokos with a medallion of Christ over her chest and womb became widespread and were frequently called Platytera or wider than the heavens after an epithet in hymnography. One also finds many images of her turned to the side with arms upraised, sometimes to a cloud with the hand of God or Christ, which often are termed Hagiosoritissa. When the Theotokos turns sideways and holds a scroll, it is sometimes called Antiphonites after the function of her icon responding to another icon of Christ in the naos of certain churches.

Terminology for gemstones also can prove confusing, because scholars often repeat terms from older catalogs without reference to the field of gemology. Museums now generally separate the geological species of nephrite (jade) from jadeite, although some people continue to refer to both as jade. Bloodstone is a solid green species of chalcedony (a cryptocrystalline quartz) found in the Rhodope Mountains of Thrace that border Greece, Bulgaria and Turkey. Bloodstone also is used to refer to the green stone with yellow inclusions. When the dark green chalcedony exhibits red inclusions like speckles, flecks or bands, it is called bloodstone. Bloodstone and bloodstone appear from a deep green to almost black stone with a waxy luster. Prase or chrysoprase is another green variety of chalcedony, although it is a rather light and bright green due to the inclusions of nickel in its formation. Serpentine is a similar but distinct species of gem that appears mottled or streaked with various shades of green and comes from the Greek province of Thessaly, which was known since Antiquity for its green marble. I use the appellation jasper largely for the red variety, unless otherwise noted.

The other major variety of stones used for Byzantine cameos are the multilayered

chalcedony gems known as onyx or sardonyx. Onyx refers to the stone with alternating layers of black and white to light blue used for many Roman state cameos. Sardonyx indicates a stone with alternating layers of rust to brown and white. It was popular for Hellenistic imperial cameos and continued to be popular into Roman times. The attraction to using either stone was the ability of the lapidary to model a range of tones in subtly varied depths.

Because this project investigates fields as diverse as alchemy and geology, in addition to more traditional historical sources, it has indebted me to many scholars. I have received generous help accessing Byzantine cameos from Georgi Parpulov at the Walters Art Museum, Baltimore; Stephen Zwirn at Dumbarton Oaks in Washington, DC; Helen Evans of the Metropolitan Museum, New York City; Richard Witschonke of the American Numismatic Society, New York City; Robert Ousterhout of the University of Pennsylvania; staff of the Victoria & Albert Museum, London; Antje Scherner of the Museumslandschaft Hessen in Kassel; Martin Hirsch in the Staatliche Münzsammlung, Munich; Michał Miśliński of the Instytut Sztuki PAN, Krakow; and Yuriy Piatnitsky of the Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg. I was humbled to receive accommodation and guidance from Charalambos Bakirtzis of the 9th Ephoreia of Byzantine Antiquities on a study trip to Thessaloniki in June 2005. Maria Vassilaki graciously invited me to attend a conference on Byzantine sculpture at the University of Thessaly, Volos in June 2009. That trip was generously funded by a Sadie and Louis Roth Fellowship from Johns Hopkins University. At Johns Hopkins University, I was fortunate to begin my study of alchemy with advice from Lawrence Principe. Recently I have benefited from the kind nudges of Mitchell Merback and the insightful comments of Nino Zchomelidse. I am grateful to

Henry Maguire for shepherding the dissertation through unforeseen twists and turns, as well as to Eunice Maguire for her friendly encouragement over the years. Finally, Laurel encouraged me to pursue doctoral studies and provided the financial stability to complete them.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

13. Ascension of Christ, 587 with 15th-century overpainting. Rabula Gospels, Plut. 1.56, Biblioteca Laurenziana, Florence. Available from: http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:RabulaGospelsFolio13vAscension.jpg.

14. Zeus-type bust of Christ. Gold solidus of Justinian II, 705. Available from: http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Solidus-Justinian_II-Christ_b-sb1413.jpg.

15. Christ Pantokrator. Sard cameo with reverse inscription in Greek to "Despot Leo" [886-†912], 4.7x3 cm. Victoria & Albert Museum, London. #126 in Glory of Byzantium [Cat. 6].

16. Romanos Ivory, 946. Cabinet des Médailles, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Available from: "Romanos IV," http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Romanos_et_Eudoxie.JPG.

17. St. John the Evangelist, before 1007-1012. Bloodstone cameo on the cover of the Gospelbook of Otto III, clm 4453, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich. #41 in Rom und Byzanz: Schatzkammerstücke aus bayerischen Sammlungen [Cat. 95].

18. St. Paul, before 1014-1024. Bloodstone cameo on the Cross Reliquary of Henry II, Schatzkammer der Residenz, Munich. #63 in Rom und Byzanz: Schatzkammerstücke aus bayerischen Sammlungen [Cat. 104].

19. Otto II and Theophano crowned by Christ, 986. Ivory relief plaque, 18.6x10.8 cm. Musée de Cluny, Paris. #337 in Glory of Byzantium.

20. St. John the Evangelist, 12th-13th century. Bloodstone cameo, 3.72x3.31x0.98 cm. Museumslandschaft Hessen, Kassel [Cat. 93].

21. Theotokos Blachernitissa. Serpentine roundel with encircling inscription to Emperor Nikephoros Botaneiates, 1078-1081. Victoria & Albert Museum, London. #130 in Glory of Byzantium [Cat. 37].

22. John the Forerunner, around 1205. Cast of bloodstone cameo with reverse inscription to Alexios V Doukas. Cini Collection, Venice. In: Hans Wentzel, "Datierte und datierbare byzantinische Kameen," fig. 2 [Cat. 102].

23. Donor kneeling before St. George, around 1205. Cast of bloodstone cameo with reverse inscription to Alexios V Doukas. Cini Collection, Venice. In: Hans Wentzel, "Datierte und datierbare byzantinische Kameen," fig. 3 [Cat. 102].

24.Gregory the Theologian, 12th century. Reverse of bloodstone Pantokrator [Cat. 3], 4.2x3x1 cm. Muzeum Narodowym, Krakow. #11 in Michał Myśliński, "Gemmy późnoantyczne i bizantyńskie w polskich kolecjach muzealnych."

25. Christ crowning Ss. George and Demetrios, late 12th century. Sardonyx cameo, 6.7x5.2x0.7 cm. Cabinet des Médailles, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Available from: http://visualiseur.bnf.fr/Visualiseur?Destination=Daguerre&O=7908999&E=JPEG&NavigationSimplifiee=ok&typeFonds=noir [Cat. 83].

26. Christ crowning Nikephoros III Botaneiates and Maria of Alania, 1071-81. Homilies of John Chrysostom, Coislin 79 fol. 1v, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Available from: http://visualiseur.bnf.fr/Visualiseur?Destination=Daguerre&O=8021030&E=JPEG&NavigationSimplifiee=ok&typeFonds=noir

27. Christ crowning John II and Alexios Komnenos, 1128. Gospels of John II Komnenos, MS Urb. gr. 2 fol. 10v, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. #144 in Glory of Byzantium.

28. Israelites slay the Ephraimites. Vat. gr. 747, f.247v. In: Maria Parani, Reconstructing the Reality of Images, fig. 144.

29. Geoffrey of Maine and Anjou, shortly after 1151. Enamel copper casket, x x. Musée de Tessé, Le Mans. #15 "Effigy of Geoffrey Plantagenet" in Enamels of Limoges, 1100-1350.

30. St. Christopher armed, c. 1180. Fresco in the Church of the Hagioi Anargyroi, Kastoria, Greece. In: Maria Parani, Reconstructing the Reality of Images, fig. 146.

31. St. George with sword and triangular shield, turn of 13th cenutry. Bloodstone cameo, 3.2x2.8 cm. Cleveland Museum of Art. #21 in Klein, Sacred Gifts and Worldly Treasures [Cat. 77].

32. Archangel Michael the General, 12th century. Icon in gold cloisonné enamel, 46 x 35 cm. Treasury of the Church of San Marco, Venice. #19 in Treasury of San Marco, Venice.

33. Archangel Michael the General, 13th century. Bloodstone cameo, 5x3.1 cm. Walters Art Gallery Baltimore. In: Putzko, "Die zwieseitige Kamee in der Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore," fig. 1A [Cat. 135].

34. Archangel Michael the General, 13th–14th century. Sapphire cameo, 3x2.1 x0.9cm. Troitse-Sergieva Lavra, Sergiev-Posad, Russia. In: Vorontsova, Vizantiiskaia ideia: Vizantiia v epokhu Komninov I Paleologov, pl. III [Cat. 140].

35. Archangel Michael the General, 12th–13th century. Bloodstone cameo, 4.8x3.15x0.95 cm. Cabinet des Médailles, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Available from: http://visualiseur.bnf.fr/Visualiseur?Destination=Daguerre&O=7917204&E=JPEG&NavigationSimplifiee=ok&typeFonds=noir [Cat. 68].

36. Archangel Michael the General, 13th century. Bloodstone cameo. Kremlin Armory, Moscow. In: Sterligova,Vizantiiskaia ideia: Vizantiia v epokhu Komninov I Paleologov, pl. XXXII [Cat. 137].

37. Daniel in the Lions' Den, 12th century. Jasper cameo, 3.4x2.5x0.85 cm. Benaki Museum, Athens. #713 in Everyday Life in Byzantium [Cat. 85].

38. Daniel in the Lions' Den, 12th-13th century. Onyx cameo, 2.55x2.07x0.33 cm. British Museum, London. Available from: http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details/collection_image_gallery.aspx?assetId=278830&objectId=60433&partId=1 [Cat. 87].

39. Daniel in the Lions' Den. 12th-13th century. Sardonyx cameo, 2.05x1.45 cm. Cathedral of the Assumption, Cividale. Courtesy of Rachel Danford [Cat. 86].

40. Daniel in the Lions' Den. 12th-13th century. Sardonyx cameo, 2.6 cm. Galleria Sabauda, Turin. In: Alice Bank, "Vier byzantinisierende Kameen," fig. 5 (mislabeled as Hermitage) [Cat. 91].

41. Daniel in the Lions' Den. 12th-13th century. Onyx cameo, 3.2 cm. Staatliche Münzsammlung, Munich [Cat. 88].

42. St. Menas flanked by camels, 5-7th centuries. Terracotta pilgrim ampulla. Musée de Louvre, Paris. In: Warren Woodfin, "An Officer and a Gentleman," fig. 2.

43. Daniel in the Lions' Den, 1059. Psalter, Vat. gr. 752, fol. 134r.

44. Daniel in the Lions' Den, early 12th century. Lead seal of Gregory Doxopatres. Hermitage, St. Petersburg. In: Ol'ga V. Osharina, "Obraz sv. Daniila vo rvu l'vinom v vizantiiskom iskusstve pozdnekomninskogo vremeni," fig. 4.

45. Grand camée de France, c. 23 AD. Sardonyx, x. Cabinet des médailles, BnF, Paris.

46. Cross of Lothair, c. 1000. Metalwork around wooden core, jewels. Palatine chapel, Aachen.

47. Angels Crowning Frederick II, 1220's. Sardonyx cameo, 5.5 cm wide. Staatliche Münzsammlung, Munich.

48. Angels Crowning Frederick II, 1220's. Sardonyx cameo, 6 cm wide. Musée de Louvre, Paris.

49. French Monarch, 13th–14th century. Sardonyx cameo, x. Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg.

50. Confronted busts of young man and woman, 13th–14th century. Sardonyx, 4 cm wide. Kusthistorisches Museum, Vienna.

51.Ptolemy Cameo, 278-270/69 BC. Sardonyx, 11.5x11.3 cm. Kunsthistorisches

Museum, Vienna.

52. Panther, 13th c. Sardonyx, x cm. Palatine Chapel, Aachen.

53. Prophet Daniel, 13th–14th c. Sardonyx cameo, 2.33x1.67x1.09 cm. Museumslandschaft-Hessen, Kassel [Cat. 151].

54. Prophet Daniel, 13th–14th c. Bloodstone cameo, 3.1x2.5x0.85 cm. Cabinet des Médailles, Paris [Cat. 152].

55. Daniel in the Lions' Den, 12th–13th c. Sardonyx cameo, 4.4x3.4 cm. Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg [Cat. 89].

56. Daniel in the Lions' Den, 12th–13th c. Sardonyx cameo, 2.4x2.2 cm. Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg [Cat. 90].

57. Daniel in the Lions' Den, 13th c. Steatite plaque, x cm. Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond.

58. Habbakkuk feeds Daniel in the lions' den, 1076. Bronze plaque from door, x cm. Monte San Angelo.

59. Prophet Daniel gesturing, 13th–14th c. Chalcedony cameo, 1.6x1.3x0.3 cm. Troitse-Sergieva Lavra, Sergiev Posad. In: Vorontsova, Vizantiiskaia ideia: Vizantiia v epokhu Komninov I Paleologov, pl. VI [Cat. 154].

60. Prophet Daniel holding a scroll, 13th–14th c. Bloodstone cameo, 8.5x5.9x1.2 cm. Troitse-Sergieva Lavra, Sergiev Posad. In: Vorontsova,Vizantiiskaia ideia: Vizantiia v epokhu Komninov I Paleologov, pl. II [Cat. 153].

61. Christ King of Glory (Man of Sorrows), 13th–14th c. Sapphirine cameo, 2.3x1.9 cm. Troitse-Sergieva Lavra, Sergiev Posad. In: Vorontsova,Vizantiiskaia ideia: Vizantiia v epokhu Komninov I Paleologov, pl. VI [Cat. 111].

62. Michael the General, 1288-1304. Fresco in the Kırk Dam Altı Kilise of Belisırama, Turkey.

63. Christ Emmanuel, 13th–14th c. Sapphire cameo, x cm. Troitse-Sergieva Lavra, Sergiev Posad. In: Vorontsova,Vizantiiskaia ideia: Vizantiia v epokhu Komninov I Paleologov, pl. II [Cat. 110].

64. Christ Emmanuel, 13th–14th c. Sardonyx cameo, x cm. Museumslandschaft-Hessen, Kassel [Cat. 108].

65. Christ Pantokrator, 13th–14th c. Sapphire cameo, 3.27x2.37x1.49 cm. Dumbarton Oaks Collection, Washington, DC [Cat. 121].

66. Theotokos Hagiosoritissa 13th–14th c. Sapphirine cameo. Troitse-Sergieva Monastery, Sergiev Posad. In: Vorontsova,Vizantiiskaia ideia: Vizantiia v epokhu Komninov I

Paleologov, pl. VI [Cat. 127].

67. Virgin & Child Enthroned, 13th–14th c. Sapphire cameo. Kremlin Armory, Moscow. In: Sterligova,Vizantiiskaia ideia: Vizantiia v epokhu Komninov I Paleologov, pl. XXVIII [Cat. 134].

68. The Crucifixion, 13th–14th c. Sapphire cameo. Kremlin Armory, Moscow. In: Sterligova, Vizantiiskaia ideia: Vizantiia v epokhu Komninov I Paleologov, pl. XXIX [Cat. 122].

69. Christ Pantokrator, 13th c. Bloodstone cameo, 4.5x4.1x1.1 cm. Cabinet des Médailles, Paris [Cat. 118].

70. St. Nicholas of Lycia, 12th–13th c. Cast or molded glass, x cm. In: Vizantiiskaia ideia: Vizantiia v epokhu Komninov I Paleologov, pl. XXX.

71. Theodore Slaying the Hydra, Post-byzantine. Banded onyx, x cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City. Courtesy of Helen Evans, Metropolitan Museum of Art [Cat. 171]

72. Emperors holding a patriarchal cross, Renaissance. Pink agate cameo. Walters Art Museum, Baltlimore [Cat. 167].

73. Rider slaying a dragon, Medieval. Carnelian intaglio. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna [Cat. 107].

74. Rider jousting, 13th-14th. Jadeite. Staatliche Münzsammlung, Munich [Cat. 158].

75. Theodore, 14th c. Bloodstone cameo. Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna [Cat. 170].

76. Christ withering the fig tree, mid-6th c. Paris, BnF suppl. gr. 1286, Sinope Gospels, fol.30v.

77. The Waters of Meribah, early-mid 9th c. Moscow, Historical Museum cod. 129, Khludov Psalter, fol. 82r. In: Kathleen Corrigan, Visual Polemics, fig. 93.

78. Clipeus of Christ and Waters of Meribah, early-mid 9th c. Mt. Athos, Pantokrator 61, fol. 114r. In: Kathleen Corrigan, Visual Polemics, fig.94.

79. Theotokos Aniketos, late 13th c. Marble relief, 120x85 cm. Cappella Zen, San Marco, Venice.

80. Daniel's dream of the stone not cut by human hands, early-mid 9th c. Moscow, Historical Museum cod. 129, Khludov Psalter, fol. 64r. In: Kathleen Corrigan, Visual Polemics, fig. 50.

81. Christ Pantokrator, later 11th c. Steatite, 4.7 cm tall. Archaeological Museum of Corinth. #706 in Everyday Life in Byzantium.

82. Ss. Peter and Paul, mid-11th to mid-12th c. Schist, 5x6.5 cm. Novgorod State Museum.

83. St. Demetrios enthroned, later 12th c. Schist, 6.2x5.5 cm. State Historical Museum, Moscow.

84. Theotokos Hagiosoritissa, 12th c. Enameled gold relief, 5.3x3.7x0.5 cm. Natsionalen Arkheologicheski Muzei, Sofia. #226 in Glory of Byzantium.

85. David Composing the Psalms, mid-10th c. Paris, BnF gr. 139, Paris Psalter, fol. 1v.

86. Theotokos Blachernitissa, 1042-1055. Marble relief from the Monastery of St. George in Mangana, 2 m x 99 cm. Istanbul Archaeological Museum.

87. Theotokos and Child, end 12th c. Carved steatite panagiarion, 9cm dia. Formerly, Mt. Athos, Panteleemon Monastery. In: Yuri Piatnitsky, "The Panagiarion of Alexios Komnenos Angelos and Middle Byzantine Painting," fig. 1.

88. The Virgin's break on her way, 1140's. Homilies on the Life of the Virgin by James Kokkinobaphos, Biblioteca apostolica gr. 752 f.147r, Vatican.

89. Gregory of Nazianzen, the Theologian, mid-12th c. Liturgical Homilies of St. Gregory of Nazianzos, Sinai gr. 339, fol. 4v. In: Glory of Byzantium, [4].

90. Theotokos Blachernitissa, 12th–13th c. Bloodstone cameo. Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lyon [Cat. 39].

91. Daniel in the Lions' Den, 13th c. Lead seal to Sebastos Liberios. Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg.

92. Theotokos Hodegetria, 13th – 14th c. Agate cameo. Sergiev Posad, Troitse-Sergieva Lavra [Cat. 131]. In: Vorontsova,Vizantiiskaia ideia: Vizantiia v epokhu Komninov I Paleologov pl.

Introduction

For people in Western societies today, jewelry has diminished to a token of graduation or marriage. However, jewels used to play a far more prominent part in signaling the status of persons in authority and the continuity of dynastic rule. Precious stones also decorated buildings and adorned the tables of state banquets, where the durability of stone vessels complemented their visual beauty as a sign of political stability. Even the new Jerusalem was built of precious stones. Given scholarly fascination with Byzantine political power and opulence, it is therefore curious that Byzantine cameos have received so little attention.

Their neglect likely derives from their lack of historical context, since only a few seem to exist in original mounts. They do not immediately reflect an obvious role in the life of the Byzantine state or court, like the royal crowns of Constantine IX Monomachos (r. 1042-1055) and Geza of Hungary (c. 1074). If cameos offered narrative scenes, then they might at least gain attention for comparison with monumental iconography. However, the large group of almost two hundred Byzantine cameos includes only a few of narrative scenes. With the exception of a simple Christ crucified in the Troitse-Sergieva Lavra outside Moscow [Cat. 122, Fig. 68], the other examples do not fit the corpus of Byzantine glyptic. Nearly all of the authentic Byzantine cameos display a saint frontally, usually with a prominent attribute or gesture. Like tiny icons without frames (most are the size of a US quarter), they sit in museum drawers in lots of several or sometimes a dozen. Only a handful are gilded. Most are rather dark and monochromatic or have inclusions in one color. Most are opaque with a dull to waxy surface. In their current state of

preservation and display, even an enthusiast must admit that Byzantine cameos appear as ugly ducklings of Byzantine art history.

Instead, the history of Byzantine art has focused on monumental programs and manuscripts, presumably because of the ready context those formats provide for dating and interpretation. Otto Demus' work on Byzantine Mosaic Decoration of 1947 and Kurt Weitzmann' work on Illustrations in Roll and Codex of the same year set the tone for the field. Even broader theoretical works such as Andre Grabar's study of Christian Iconography, published in English in 1968, or Hans Belting's Likeness and Presence, published in English in 1994, tried to insert Byzantine panel paintings into the prior discussion of frescoes, mosaics and sculptures. Only since the turn of the millennium has Byzantine art history begun to focus on so-called minor arts, albeit as expressions of personal identities outside the norms of official Byzantine art. The 2003 Harvard exhibition on Byzantine Women and their World and the traveling exhibition of the Dumbarton Oaks collection in 2005, entitled Sacred Art, Secular Context, both prominently included Byzantine cameos for the first time in decades. The book-length study of Other Icons by Eunice and Henry Maguire in 2007 marks the first major attempt to fit Byzantine minor arts within a larger narrative of Byzantine art, although even it largely leaves aside glyptic.

As small, precious, durable works bearing standard ecclesiastical iconography, Byzantine cameos offer an opportune set of data by which to analyze prevailing theories of the Byzantine icon. This dissertation considers over one hundred and seventy gemstones carved with saints or figures that might be saints that have been ascribed to Byzantium. The study separates about half a dozen as probably not of Byzantine provenance. It also

separates Byzantine cameos from local stone works in Kievan Rus' and glass pilgrim tokens from the Levant. Although several transitional works from the end of Byzantine Iconoclasm in 843 and the end of the Byzantine period frame the study, the dissertation formally spans the period from the accession of Emperor Leo VI in 886 to the fall of Constantinople in 1453. The material only admits of traditional historical methods of textual reference and stylistic analysis. The four cameos with inscriptions to imperial figures provide only general checkpoints for dating, as do several other examples with distinct changes in armor or weapons. Historical dates for objects to which cameos are attached provide endpoints for the creation of several more examples. Furthermore, in my work with museums to study these cameos personally, no one has been able to affirm that the stones were studied recently using modern methods of gemmological research. This dissertation consequently advances the study of Byzantine art, specifically our understanding of the icon, in three related ways. For the first time, it creates a complete corpus of Byzantine cameos to help scholars navigate these far-flung materials, which generally consist of fewer than a dozen items in a collection. On a deeper level, it studies the corpus of Byzantine cameos in a comprehensive historical way to define them as a genre of art object. Finally, it integrates Byzantine cameos and theories of the image in a more synthetic view of the Byzantine icon as an enduring cultural term.

Before European collections of cameos even had been cataloged, M. Ernest Babelon published an essay on La gravure en pierres fines, camées et intailles in 1894. However, the first sustained modern study of Byzantine cameos began with Hans

Wentzel's attention to separating Byzantine from Medieval glyptic.[1] He went on to write more than two dozen articles that cataloged Byzantine and Medieval glyptic in German and Italian collections. In documenting them, he also perceptively framed the problems of grouping and dating European cameos more generally from late Antiquity to the Renaissance.[2] His attention to the widely diverging styles of sardonyx cameos proved a particularly useful place to begin grouping Byzantine and Medieval cameos. However, he largely ignored the mass of Byzantine cameos in bloodstone, which also exhibit several distinct styles. His work also largely ignores several dozen Byzantine cameos found in Communist countries of the day. Thus his contribution to our understanding of Byzantine glyptic, while important, is limited.

For her part, the important Russian curator, Alice V. Bank, repeatedly published studies on Byzantine glyptic during the same decades. She cataloged examples of Byzantine glyptic in Soviet collections and engaged with Wentzel's work in a German and an Italian article, as well as in Russian and Serbian articles. In the early 1970's, Vasilii G. Putsko also wrote several articles on Byzantine glyptic in French, German and Serbian that drew useful comparisons between cameos in Soviet collections. Unfortunately, Bank's three-volume Russian survey of Byzantine art in Soviet collections of 1977 came just two years after Wentzel's untimely death at age 62. The condensed but richly illustrated survey of works in Soviet Collections appeared in English a year later, but interest in Byzantine glyptic had passed for another generation.

---

1 Hans Wentzel, "Mittelalterliche Gemmen: Versuch einer Grundlegung," Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft 8 (1941): 45-98, is the fountain head.

2 See the bibliography of his works in Beiträge zur Kunst des Mittelalters: Festschrift für Hans Wentzel zum 60. Geburtstag eds. Rüdiger Becksmann, Ulf-Dietrich Korn and Johannes Zahlten (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1975).

Ioli Kalavrezou's catalog of Byzantine Icons in Steatite from 1985 subsequently proved remarkable for analyzing small Byzantine glyptics in terms of aesthetics and function that have proved useful for understanding cameos. Wentzel and Bank largely avoided these theoretical aspects of Byzantine cameos in favor of the more immediate need to classify them. Kalavrezou was prescient in her use of Byzantine epigrams to discover Byzantine terms of appreciation for steatite as the "blameless stone" (amiantos lithos) and for its green hue. Because these citations come from the late Byzantine period though, their application to earlier works is problematic without more historical analysis of aesthetics from earlier centuries, a problem that this study attempts to rectify.

Recently, Bissera V. Pentcheva, a former student of Kalavrezou, has proposed a general theology and aesthetic of imprinting as central to a proper understanding of middle Byzantine art. Her study of The Sensual Icon in 2010 proposes the matrix and seal as the guiding metaphor for the rise of the Byzantine icon. This ideological commitment to metal stamping largely confines her study to a few surviving enameled metal icons. Nevertheless, the work raises all sorts of interesting questions about the meaning of sculpture in Byzantine art and provides a useful snapshot of Byzantine aesthetics in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Chapter 1

The dissertation begins with a catalog and analysis of middle Byzantine cameos, seeking especially to discover stylistic cues to dating. All the cameos dateable by inscription and most dateable by context or iconography fall within this period, but their style varies widely. This chapter briefly considers the few examples that survive from the time of

Iconoclasm in order to separate Byzantine glyptic clearly from Antique glyptic. It further surveys middle Byzantine glyptic materials and iconography to discern the normative bounds of Byzantine glyptic. Although no surviving cameo comes out of an archaeological context, the stylistic affinities between dateable cameos and the rest of the corpus offer reassurance that the mass of surviving cameos represent a coherent body of Byzantine works, even if a dozen or so are suspect on stylistic, iconographical or logical grounds.

The other major means of defining middle Byzantine cameos are case studies of major iconographical groupings of cameos. From historical sources and the materials themselves, we can assume that glyptic was a craft tradition with a high degree of continuity in materials, methods and subjects across Byzantine territory over centuries. It consequently would prove tedious simply to compare images of Christ or the Theotokos, which tend toward homogeneity. Rather our study begins with cameos of the Prophet Daniel, which portray him either in the lions' den or as a prophet with scroll. This small group also includes a variety of gemstones that seems to reflect larger trends in Byzantine glyptic. Establishing norms of Byzantine glyptic overall and testing them against a heterogeneous iconographical group admittedly introduces a degree of circularity to the study. However, the historical study of cameos can only be based on logical arguments weighed against a burden of proof without dateable references, signatures or physical means of provenance.

Chapter 2

The survey of late Byzantine cameos relies heavily on analyzing later trends against the norms established for middle Byzantine glyptic in the previous chapter. Because of the

sudden cultural exchange caused by the Crusades though, it is impossible to treat late Byzantine cameos as a simple extension of or reaction to early Byzantine ones. First, it is necessary to ask where glyptic flourished in Medieval Europe and whether any connection between Western Medieval glyptic and Byzantine glyptic plausibly exists. Next, the study delineates Byzantine from so-called byzantinizing cameos of the Medieval period.

In the previous chapter, the case study of Daniel cameos helped distinguish middle Byzantine subjects and materials from later ones. This chapter focuses on how late Byzantine and byzantinizing cameos of Daniel reflect trends in Byzantine versus Medieval glyptic. Studying the small group of Byzantine cameos that represent the archangel Michael further delineate late marks of late Byzantine glyptic.

Along with the sudden appearance of Western Medieval cameos around the thirteenth century, museum collections hold over a hundred glass cameos of unknown provenance. Their iconography seems to place them between the twelfth and sixteenth century, but their titulature in Latin or Greek is ambiguous. Because they are the same size as cameos and in relief, I consider their relationship to Byzantine cameos.

Finally, a case study of Western imitations of Byzantine cameos further defines what makes Byzantine cameos Byzantine. These are modern imitations and not the byzantinizing works of Medieval craftsmen. Some likely were created in the past hundred years or so to make money, while others more likely are bravura pieces from the early Modern period. What is most important for this study of Byzantine cameos is to separate the aims and means of Byzantine glyptic from Medieval and Modern glyptic.

Chapter 3

Following a technical study of Byzantine glyptic, the dissertation considers its theoretical motivations. After all, a surprising amount of sculptural works survive from the middle Byzantine period, from lead seals and ivories to marble reliefs and cameos. They nearly all exhibit religious subjects, except for several dozen ivory boxes with ambiguous warriors and other motifs of a secular character. Alongside illuminated ecclesiastical books and church frescoes, Byzantium seems to have been filled with sculpted images of saints. The study of Byzantine glyptic therefore has to inquire of written and visual religious sources what kind of theories of materials or methods or visuality might have motivated the production of so many sculpted icons. Indeed, how do sculpted icons express or reflect Byzantine understandings of the icon?

First of all, the Church of Constantinople was surprisingly ambivalent about Christian art. It had inherited an artistic tradition that remained essentially Roman, and Byzantine society continued to use Classical texts as the standard of excellence in writing about – indeed, imagining – the surrounding world. While the Council in Trullo of 692 banned symbolism in Christian art, the Second Council of Nicea in 787 merely advocated the veneration of Christ and the saints in appropriately high-status materials. Most of the discussion of icons by those who advocated them spoke of rendering an image that could be recognized by its title and attributes as an historical figure.

Biblical commentators were faced with a dilemma, as the Scriptures ignored most historical detail in favor of narrative with very specific theological aims. On a textual level, Greek Christian commentators followed St. Paul's allegorical interpretation that the rock from which Moses drew water at Meribah was Christ (Ex 17:6 in 1Cor 10:1-5). As Origen

already explained in the early third century, Christ was the agent in the theophanies of the Old Testament. It was enough for Byzantine commentators to follow this theology of the Logos as theophanic in order to bridge the gap between the historical Israel of the Scriptures and the New Israel of Byzantium. They largely ignored its significance for Christian art.

Far more provocative are marginal psalters, illuminated homilies and illuminations of Genesis that do imagine Christ's theophany as iconic. At the waters of Meribah, the Byzantine type of Christ usually appears to facilitate the miracle. Sometimes He stands with a gesture of blessing behind Moses as the real agent. Sometimes He sits atop the rock blessing, like the old personification of the river. Most interesting are illuminations where a clipeated bust of Christ appears in or near the Old Testament scene to link the theophany of the Word to the icon of Byzantine history.

The same golden clipeus with pearled border of Christ or the Virgin and Child appears in representations of the prophet Daniel's dream of a stone uncut by human hands. These illuminations sometimes show the clipeus on a chunk of stone falling from a mountain on Daniel in his sleep. The connection between stone, icon and theophany here is explicit both in commentaries and illuminations. Because the dream was an allegory of God's Kingdom crushing pre-Christian Mediterranean civilizations, the Byzantines found an authority for their imperial rule quite literally under the sign of the Incarnate Word.

Chapter 4

Finally, the question of how Byzantine cameos were made or what Byzantine Christians wanted to possess leads to the question of how Byzantines received these little

icons as aesthetic objects. Since nearly all of the cameos have been ripped from a functional context long ago, I study the Byzantine poetry written about icons for signs of how one might reconstruct their reception. Few poems mention the actual material or form of the icon, in favor of magnifying the saint and the beholder's reaction to the icon. It is therefore necessary to look for motifs and tropes that help us grasp what aesthetic factors made an icon transformative in the Byzantine mind.

Ioli Kalavrezou's comprehensive catalog of Byzantine Icons in Steatite from 1985 demonstrated how widespread enkolpia were in the Byzantine world. The use of eyelets, arched tops and votive formulae on some examples provide strong evidence that they were viewed as small icons. Russian examples in local stone of new Russian saints underlines the point. When we find gemstone cameos with similar attributes then, we can assume that Byzantine viewers likewise viewed them as "little icons," as one late Byzantine poem that Kalavrezou quotes puts it.

In contrast to the homogenous corpus of green steatites, Bissera V. Pentcheva recently argued that the ground for reconstructing a Byzantine understanding of icons should be metal icons. Based on the two enameled icons of the Archangel Michael now in the treasury of San Marco, Venice, she claims that the Byzantine icon sought to create an experience of the divine presence through an aesthetic of variety, poikilia in Greek. However, the mass of sculptural icons are rarely polychromed, whether in marble, steatite, gemstones or ivory. This lack of contrast in so many major bodies of Byzantine art make it difficult to agree with Liz James' thesis that the Byzantines experienced color largely in tonal terms. In fact, what stands out from surviving sculptural icons is their lack of poikilia or tonality in favor of materials used in a more or less natural state.

Henry Maguire offered a solution to understanding this penchant for natural materials through a Byzantine appreciation of pallor or ochrotes. In his book on The Icons of Their Bodies: Saints and Their Images in Byzantium from 1996, Maguire pointed to Byzantine descriptions of icons that associate pallor with purity and sanctity. It is tempting to associate such pallor with a somber palette or monochromy, but the texts he cites suggest it was precisely the unadulterated character of the material that they most appreciated. Purity was the point in using a precious material, rather than it being white or light or of a subdued palette.

Furthermore, Kalavrezou found a middle Byzantine description of an icon of the Theotokos carved from the "spotless stone," amiantos lithos, in a monastic inventory of icons. She linked it to a grayish-green steatite paten or panagiarion dedicated to Emperor Alexios III Komnenos Angelos (1195-1203) that used the same term of itself in the inscription. The ambiguous term for this stone reinforces Maguire's point that purity was a prominent symbolic association with whatever precious materials were used for icons, including the largely monochromatic corpus of Byzantine cameos. However, the overarching metaphor of the poetic inscription is that of the garden, and it does not allude to the purity of its materials. From the twelfth century on, manuscript illuminations and icons often enclose holy persons in a garden space. In contemporary literature as well, the motif of verdure rises to particular prominence. Across the Byzantine arts of the Komnenian dynasty it appears that "all of Creation rejoices in [the] Theotokos," as a Byzantine hymn exclaims.

I suggest that Byzantine cameos point to a synthesis of religious and political discourses that viewed Byzantium as the paradisaical kingdom of God on earth. As

pretentious as it may strike modern readers, icons did not so much open windows onto a shadowy Heaven beyond so much as they uncovered fossils of salvation history that retained the real dimensions and shape of saints. Churches then became more like natural history museums than art museums in their aim to reconstruct the ecosystem of salvation. This shift of viewpoint from icons as art to icons as relics also might help to explain the Byzantine insistence on the lifelike quality of their icons, precisely as reconstructions of a living present.

No matter how scientifically the dissertation attempts to treat the disparate materials of history though, Byzantine cameos remain objects of human art beyond their own cultural moment. They often are beautiful objects, whose faces stare back at the beholder with lively expressions that seem on the verge of speaking. Besides any ideological force they once carried, their human portraits continue to speak to our humanity. That encounter is what animates the following study.

1 Cameos of the Middle Byzantine Period (9th-12th c.)

Christ

1. Intaglio of the Deesis [Fig. 11]
820's-850's
Reverse: low relief of the Annunciation
6th-7th
Onyx
4x3.55x.8
Inscription obverse: +ΘΚΕ ΒΟΗΘΙ ΤΗΝ ΔΟVΛΙΝ C ΑΝΑ
"Theotokos, help your servant Anna"
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Cabinet des Medailles
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #184

2. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
Reverse: Theotokos Blachernitissa
11th
Bloodstone
4.6x2.7x.7
Athens, Benaki Museum
Everyday Life in Byzantium #711

3. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
Reverse: Gregory Theologian blessing [Fig. 24]
12th
Bloodstone
4.2x3.0x1.0
Krakow, Muzeum Narodowym w Krakowie
Myśliński, "Gemmy późnoantyczne i bizantyńskie," #11.

4. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
11th-12th
Bloodstone
4.2 length
London, British Museum
Catalogue of the Engraved Gems of the Post-Classical Periods #8

5. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
11th-12th
Sapphire
2.8 length

London, British Museum
Catalogue of the Engraved Gems of the Post-Classical Periods #9

6. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator [Fig. 15]
Reverse: ΙΗCΟΥ CѠCΟΝ on cross and ΛΕΟ/ΝΤΑ ΔΕC/ΠΟ in corners
"Jesus, save Leo, Despot"
886-912
Sard
4.7x3
London, V & A Museum (A.21-1932)
Glory of Byzantium #126.

7. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
Reverse: Anastasis
12th
Bloodstone
6.2x4.8
Moscow, State Historical Museum
Iskusstvo Vizantii v sobraniiakh SSSR #645

8. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
10th-11th
Bloodstone
8.8x5
Moscow, Kremlin Armory
Byzantine Art in Soviet Collections #154

9. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
Reverse: cross
11th
Lapis Lazuli
15x7.8
Moscow, Kremlin Armory
Glory of Byzantium #129

10. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
11th-12th
Bloodstone
2.7x2.5
Moscow, State Historical Museum
Iskusstvo Vizantii v sobraniiakh SSSR #643

11. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator

11th
Sardonyx
1.8x2.9
Moscow, State Historical Museum
Iskusstvo Vizantii v sobraniyakh SSSR #637

12. Cameo with Christ Pantokrator
11th-12th
Bloodstone
5.3x4.5
Munich, Bavaria Archaeological Museum
Die Welt von Byzanz: Europas östliches Erbe #700

13. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
10th
Amethyst
2.85x.7x.6
Paris, Cabinet des Médailles
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #185

14. Intaglio of Christ Pantokrator [Fig. 10]
9th
Emerald
1.2 diameter
Inscription: ✣ΚΕΒΟΗΘΒΑCΙΛΕΙѠΠΑΡΑΚΟΙΜΥΜΤΥΔΕCΠ
"Lord, help Basil, parakoimomenos of the despot"
Paris, Cabinet des Medailles
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #219

15. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
12th
Bloodstone
2.9x2.4x1
Paris, Cabinet des Médailles
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #200

16. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
11th
Bloodstone
4.5x3.9x1.15
Paris, Cabinet des Médailles
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #190

17. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
10th
Amethyst
2x1.2x.8
Paris, Louvre
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #186

18. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
Reverse: Theotokos Blachernitissa
12th
Lapis Lazuli
6.4x4.3
Paris, Louvre
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #195

19. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
11th
Bloodstone
8.2 diameter
Philadelphia, University Museum
Early Christian & Byzantine Art #554

20. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
Obverse: IC XC O ΕΛΕΗΜΩΝ "Jesus Christ the Merciful"
Reverse: ΧΡΙCΤΕ Ο ΘΕΟC Ο ΕΙC CΕ ΕΛΠΙΖΩ ΟΥΚ ΑΠΟΤΥΓΧΑΝΕΙ
"Christ God, the one who hopes in you does not fail"
11th (early)
Bloodstone
3 diameter
St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum
Sinai, Byzantium, Russia #B55

21. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
11th
Bloodstone
4.5x3.8
St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum
Sinai, Byzantium, Russia #B56

22. Cameo with Christ Pantokrator Enthroned
11th (mid)
Bloodstone
3.3x2.7

St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum
Glory of Byzantium #131

23. Cameo with Christ Pantokrator
11th (late)
Bloodstone
4.2x3.3
St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum
Sinai, Byzantium, Russia #B78

24. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
11th (early)
Bloodstone
Vatican, Museo Sacro
Rhighetti, "Le opere di glittica dei Musei Annessi alla Biblioteca Vaticana," tav. V fig. 1

25. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
11th (early)
Bloodstone
Vatican, Museo Sacro
Rhighetti, "Le opere di glittica dei Musei Annessi alla Biblioteca Vaticana," tav. V fig. 3

26. Pendant with Christ Pantokrator
12th-13th
Steatite
Vatican, Museo Sacro
Rhighetti, "Le opere di glittica dei Musei Annessi alla Biblioteca Vaticana," tav. V fig. 6

27. Cameo with Christ Pantokrator
12th -13th
Bloodstone
Vatican, Museo Sacro
Rhighetti, "Le opere di glittica dei Musei Annessi alla Biblioteca Vaticana," tav. IX fig. 3

28. Cameo with Christ Pantokrator
12th
Bloodstone
4.8x3.3
Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Kunstkammer
Die Kameen im Kunsthistorischen Museum #128

29. Cameo with Christ Pantokrator
11^{th}-12^{th}

Lapis Lazuli
Parish of Most Holy Lady Mary
Włocławek, Diecezja włocłaska
Myśliński, "Gemmy późnoantyczne i bizantyńskie w polskich kolecjach muzealnych," #10

30. Cameo of the Crucifixion
10th
Bloodstone
6.5x6.0
London, V & A Museum
Masterpieces of Byzantine Art #86

31. Cameo of the Crucifixion
12th-13th
Bloodstone
Vatican, Museo Sacro
Rhighetti, "Le opere di glittica dei Musei Annessi alla Biblioteca Vaticana," tav. X fig. 4

32. Cameo of the Crucifixion
12th
Sapphire
2x1.8
Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Kunstkammer
Katalog der Sammlung für Plastik und Kunstgewerbe 1: Mittelalter

33. Intaglio of Christ Healing the Hemorrhoissa [Fig. 3-4]
Reverse: Theotokos Orant between Cypress Trees
9th
Bloodstone
5.0x3.5
Inscription obverse: ✠ΚΕ Η ΓVΝΙ/ΟVCΑ PVCΗΕ/ΜΑΤΟC ΕΤΙ/ ΚΕ ΠΟΛΛ/ ΟVCΑ Η ΚΕ ΕΔ Α/ΠΑΝΙCΑ ΜΙΔΕ/Ν ΟΦΕΛΕΘΟ [ΕΙ]/CΑ ΑΛΑ ΜΑΛ/ ΗΔΕ/Α/ΜΟVCΑ
Inscirption reverse: +[Ε]ƵΗΡΑΝ/ΘΗ Η ΠΗΓΗ ΤΟ[V]/ VΜΑ/ΤΗCΜ/ΟV ΑVΤ/ΗC ΕΝΤΟ/ ΝΟΜ/ΑΤΙ Τ/ΗC ΠΙCΤ/ΕΟC/ ΤΙC
Paraphrase of Mark 5:25-34
New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art
Byzantine Women and Their World #165

34. Cameo of the Transfiguration
12th-13th
Bloodstone
6.6x5.3
Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Kunstkammer

Die Kameen im Kunsthistorischen Museum #135

Theotokos

35. Cameo of Theotokos Blachernitissa
11th-12th
Bloodstone
6.4x3.85x.66
London, British Museum
Byzantium: Treasures of Byzantine Art and Culture from British Collections #172

36. Cameo of Theotokos Blachernitissa
12th
Bloodstone
3.3 length
London, British Museum
Catalogue of the Engraved Gems of the Post-Classical Periods #11

37. Cameo of Theotokos Blachernitissa [Fig. 21]
1078-1081
Serpentine
17.5 diameter
Inscription on rim: ΘK [BO]HΘEINIKHΦOPΩΦIΛOXPICTΩΔECΠO
HTΩBOTANEIATH+
"Theotokos, help Nikephoros Botaneiates the Christ-loving despot"
London, Victoria & Albert Museum
Glory of Byzantium #130

38. Cameo of Theotokos Blachernitissa
12th
Bloodstone
2.5x1.8x.9
Lyon, Museum des Beaux-Arts
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #197

39. Cameo of Theotokos Blachernitissa [Fig. 90]
12th-13th
Bloodstone
2.0x1.9x.6
Lyon, Museum des Beaux-Arts
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #198

40. Cameo of Theotokos Blachernitissa
12th
Bloodstone
2.3x2.2x.8
Oxford, Ashmolean Museum
Henig, The Content Family Collection of Ancient Cameos #194, Pl. XLVI

41. Cameo of Theotokos Blachernitissa
12th
Bloodstone
4x2.9x1.3
Paris, BN, Cabinet des Médailles
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #196

42. Cameo of Theotokos Blachernitissa
12th
Bloodstone
3 diameter
Paris, Louvre
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #194

43. Cameo of Theotokos Blachernitissa
11th
Bloodstone
4.5x3.8
St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum
Sinai, Byzantium, Russia #B56

44. Cameo of Theotokos Blachernitissa
11th
Bloodstone
3.8 tall
St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum
Iskusstvo Vizantii v sobraniiakh SSSR #633

45. Cameo of Theotokos Blachernitissa
$10^{th}/11^{th}$
Amethyst
3.0x2.0
Private collection in Britain
Masterpieces of Byzantine Art #184

46. Cameo of Theotokos Blachernitissa
11th
Bloodstone
6.1x3.4
Washington, Dumbarton Oaks
Sacred Art, Secular Context #4

47. Cameo of Theotokos Hagiosoritissa
Reverse: cross
12th
Bloodstone
4.9x2.8
Baltimore, Walters Art Museum
Glory of Byzantium #135

48. Cameo of Theotokos Hagiosoritissa
11th
Emerald
Cividale, Cathedral of the Assumption
Santangelo, Cividale, "Croce Astile," p. 48

49. Cameo of Theotokos Hagiosoritissa
12th -13th
Amethyst
3.2x3.3x.8 cm
Mt. Athos, Vatopedi Monastery
Treasures of Mount Athos 9.10

50. Cameo of Theotokos Hagiosoritissa
12th
Bloodstone
2.2x1.6
Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Kunstkammer
Kameen im Kunsthistorischen Museum #134

51. Cameo of Theotokos Hagiosoritissa
12th-13th
Quartz, green
3.1x2.4
Washington, Dumbarton Oaks
Sacred Art, Secular Context #5

52. Cameo of Theotokos Hagiosoritissa
12th
Bloodstone
Washington, Dumbarton Oaks
Sacred Art, Secular Context #6

53. Cameo of Theotokos Hodegetria
12th
Bloodstone
3.6 length
London, British Museum
Catalogue of the Engraved Gems of the Post-Classical Periods #12

54. Cameo of Theotokos Hodegetria
12th
Bloodstone
3.6 length
London, British Museum
Catalogue of the Engraved Gems of the Post-Classical Periods #13

55. Cameo of Theotokos Hodegetria
12th
Bloodstone
4.25x3.5x.9
Paris, BN, Cabinet des Médailles
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #199

56. Cameo of Theotokos Hodegetria
Reverse: John the Forerunner Holding Cross
12th
Bloodstone
Vatican, Museo Sacro
Rhighetti, "Le opere di glittica dei Musei Annessi alla Biblioteca Vaticana," tav. V fig. 7

57. Cameo of Theotokos Nikopoios
11th (late)
Sardonyx
4.1 length
New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art
Helen C. Evans, Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin, Spring 2001

58. Cameo of Theotokos Nikopoios
12th (late)

Sardonyx
2.8x2.2
St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum
Sinai, Byzantium, Russia #B79

59. Cameo of Theotokos Platytera
12th (late)
Bloodstone
4.5
London, V & A Museum
Glory of Byzantium #134

60. Cameo of Theotokos Platytera
12th
Sardonyx
2.9x2.6
Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum,Kunstkammer (IXa 12)
Byzanz: Pracht und Alltag #163

61. Cameo of the Virgin and Child Enthroned
11th-12th
Lapis Lazuli
7x5.5
Moscow, Kremlin Armory
Byzantine Art in Soviet Collections #155

62. Cameo of the Annunciation
11th
Onyx
1.8 length
London, British Museum
Catalogue of the Engraved Gems of the Post-Classical Periods #66

63. Cameo of the Annunciation
10th-12th
Bloodstone
1.6x1.4x.3
Munich, Bavaria Archaeological Museum
Byzanz: Das Licht aus dem Osten IV.79

64. Cameo with Dormition of the Theotokos
12th
Chrysoprase

4.6x3.5
Moscow, Kremlin Armory
Iskusstvo Vizantii v sobraniyakh SSSR #646

Archangel Michael

65. Cameo with Michael Holding Sword
11th-12th
Bloodstone
2.8 diameter
Athens, Numismatic Museum
Everyday Life in Byzantium #712

66. Cameo with Michael Holding Sword
Reverse: St. Demetrios
12th
Bloodstone
5x3.1
Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery
Early Christian & Byzantine Art #556

67. Cameo with Michael Holding Sword
11th – 12th
Sardonyx
3.1 tall
New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art
Unpublished

68. Cameo of Michael Holding Sword [Fig. 35]
12th – 13th
Bloodstone
4.8x3.15x.95
Paris, BN, Cabinet des Médailles
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #189

Bishops

69. Cameo of Basil Blessing
10th
Chalcedony, blue
2.1x1.6
St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum
Byzantine Art in Soviet Collections #162

70. Cameo of Nicholas Blessing
10th-11th
Sardonyx
3.6x3.3
Belgrade, Muzej Primenjene Umetnosti
Objets sculptés d'art mineur en serbie ancienne #5

71. Cameo with Nicholas Blessing
12th-13th
Jasper
2.6x2.0
Boston, Museum of Fine Arts
Early Christian & Byzantine Art #559

72. Cameo of Nicholas Holding Book
11th
Bloodstone
5.8x4.4x1.2
Lyon, Museum des Beaux-Arts
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #187

73. Cameo of Nicholas Blessing
11th
Sardonyx
3x2.5
Moscow, Kremlin Armory
Byzantine Art in Soviet Collections #157

74. Cameo with Nicholas Blessing
12th-13th
Sapphirine
3.4x2.0
Paris, Louvre
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #201

Soldiers

75. Cameo of Demetrios Holding Spear
11th
Jasper, banded
3.25x2.3x.75
Paris, BN, Cabinet des Médailles
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #192

76. Cameo of Demetrios Holding Cross
11th (early)
Bloodstone
Vatican, Museo Sacro
Rhighetti, "Le opere di glittica dei Musei Annessi alla Biblioteca Vaticana," tav. V fig. 2

77. Cameo of George Holding Sword [Fig. 31]
12th (late)
Bloodstone
3.2x2.8
Cleveland Museum of Art
Sacred Gifts & Worldly Treasures #21

78. Cameo of George Holding Sword
12th
Bloodstone
4.09x2.82x1.02
London, British Museum
Byzantium: Treasures of Byzantine Art and Culture from British Collections #173

79. Cameo of George Holding Spear
11th
Sardonyx
3.5x2.2
Moscow, Kremlin
Iskusstvo Vizantii v sobraniyakh SSSR #638

80. Cameo of George Holding Spear
11th
Jadeite
2.7x2.1
Sergiev Posad, Museum of History and Art
Museum of History and Art, Zagorsk #61

81. Cameo of George Holding Sword
12th
Bloodstone
3.9x2.6
Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Kunstkammer
Die Kameen im Kunsthistorischen Museum #129

82. Cameo of George Holding Sword
12th
Sapphire
2.9x2.3
Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Kunstkammer (ANSA X 12)
Byzanz: Pracht und Alltag #164

83. Cameo of Christ Crowning Demetrios & George [Fig. 25]
12th
Sardonyx
6.7x5.2x.7
Paris, BN, Cabinet des Médailles
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #193

84. Cameo of Demetrios & George Holding Cross
10th
Chalcedony, blue
2.7x2
St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum
Byzantine Art in Soviet Collections #163

Daniel

85. Cameo of Daniel in the Lion's Den [Fig. 37]
12th
Jasper, red
3.4x2.5x.85
Athens, Benaki Museum
Everyday Life in Byzantium #713

86. Cameo of Daniel in the Lions' Den [Fig. 39]
12th-13th
Sardonyx (light on dark)
Cividale, Cathedral of the Assumption
Menis, "Un malnoto cameo cividalese con Daniele"

87. Cameo of Daniel in the Lions' Den [Fig. 38]
12th-13th
Onyx (blue on black)
2.55x2.07
London, British Museum
Byzantium: Treasures of Byzantine Art and Culture from British Collections #174

88. Cameo of Daniel in the Lions' Den [Fig. 41]
12th-13th
Onyx (blue on black)
3.1x2.6
Munich, Staatliche Münzsammlung
Rom und Byzanz: Schatzkammerstücke aus bayerischen Sammlungen #80

89. Cameo of Daniel in the Lions' Den [Fig. 55]
12th-13th
Sardonyx (dark on light)
4.4 cm x 3.4 cm
St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum (inv. ω.368)
Bank, "Vier byzantinisierende Kameen aus der Ermitage," fig. 3

90. Cameo of Daniel in the Lions' Den [Fig. 56]
12th-13th
Sardonyx
2.4 cm x 2.2 cm
St. Petersburg, Hermitage Museum (inv. ω.360)
Bank, "Vier byzantinisierende Kameen aus der Ermitage," fig. 4

91. Cameo of Daniel in the Lions' Den [Fig. 40]
12th-13th
Sardonyx (dark on light)
Turin, Galleria Sabauda (inv. 133)
Moretti, Roma bizantina, 127-28 fig. 42

Irene

92. Cameo with Irene Holding Cross
11th -12th
Garnet
1.9 tall
Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery
Unpublished

John the Evangelist

93. Cameo of John the Evangelist Holding Book [Fig. 20]
12th-13th
Bloodstone
3.72x3.31x.98
Kassel, Museumslandschaft Hessen Kassel
Wentzel, "Die byzantinischen Kameen in Kassel," pp. 90-91 fig. 85

94. Intaglio of John the Evangelist
10th-11th
Bloodstone
London, V & A Museum
Catalogue of Rings: Victoria and Albert Museum #224

95. Cameo of John the Evangelist Holding Book [Fig. 17]
10th (late)
Bloodstone
3.2 tall
Gospelbook of Otto III
Munich, Bayerische Stb., clm 4453
Rom und Byzanz: Schatzkammerstücke aus bayerischen Sammlungen #41

96. Cameo of John the Evangelist Enthroned Holding Book
11th
Bloodstone with yellow vein
4.7x4.5x1
Paris, BN, Cabinet des Médailles
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #188

97. Cameo of John the Evangelist Holding Book
12th
Bloodstone with yellow vein
3.35x2.95x1.2
Paris, BN, Cabinet des Médailles
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #203

98. Cameo of John the Evangelist Holding Book
11th
Chrysoprase
2x1.7
Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum
Kameen im Kunsthistorischen Museum #138

John the Forerunner

99. Cameo with John the Forerunner Holding Cross
12th
Bloodstone
4.7x3.9
Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery

Early Christian & Byzantine Art #557

100. Cameo of John the Forerunner
10th-11th
Sardonyx
1.8 length
London, British Museum
Catalogue of the Engraved Gems of the Post-Classical Periods #7

101. Cameo of John the Forerunner Holding Cross
11th
Bloodstone
4.5x3.5x1
Moscow, State Historical Museum
Iskusstvo Vizantii v sobraniyakh SSSR #639

102. Cameo of John the Forerunner [Fig. 22]
Reverse: George with donor kneeling on his right [Fig. 23]
Inscription: ΑΛΕƷΙΟC ΔΥΚΑC "Alexios Doukas"
c.1205
Bloodstone
Venice, Cini Collections
Hans Wentzel, "Datierte und datierbare byzantinische Kameen," figs. 2-3

103. Cameo of John the Forerunner Holding Cross
11th
Bloodstone
4.6x4.4
Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Kunstkammer (ANSA IXa 20)
Byzanz: Pracht und Alltag #165

Paul

104. Cameo of Paul Blessing [Fig. 18]
10th (late)
Bloodstone
3.5 tall
Cross reliquary Henry II
Munich, Schatzkammer der Residenz
Rom und Byzanz: Schatzkammerstücke aus bayerischen Sammlungen #63

Amulets

105. Intaglio of Medusa
Inscription: CTEPA MEΛANHOC OC OΦH
Reverse: Bust of Servatius
Reverse inscription: HCTHC AΓIOC KC OCA "
10th-12th
Bloodstone
5.4 diameter
Maastricht, Cathedral Treasury
J. Spier, "Byzantine Magical Amulets," #58

106. Intaglio of Medusa
Inscription: <Y>CTEPA MEΛANH KAI MEΛANOMENH
Reverse: Archangel Michael Standing with Globe
7-9th
Bloodstone
Selçuk, Ephesus Museum
J. Spier, "Byzantine Magical Amulets," #55

107. Intaglio of Rider Slaying Dragon [Fig. 73]
Reverse: Slavonic inscription BP BE
10-12th
Carnelian
2.52x2.03x.64
Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum
Die Antiken Gemmen des Kunsthistorischen Museums in Wien #2177 (vol. 3)

Materials and Subjects of Byzantine Cameos

The basic archeology of middle and late Byzantine cameos differs markedly from late Antique glyptics. Nearly all the Byzantine stones chosen for glyptic are opaque, including dozens of steatite cameos and dozens more in a common Russian flint. At most, about two dozen rock crystal seals and a handful of amethyst, prase, or sapphire cameos were cut following Byzantine Iconoclasm. This distribution is hardly surprising in light of the Islamic conquest of Egypt and eastern trade routes.[3] Since a first-century Latin seafaring guide described the busy commerce in pearls and "transparent gems" at southern Indian emporiums,[4] the Roman trade of luxury goods at Indian sites seems to have slowed only two centuries later.[5] Sri Lanka, known to the Romans as Taprobane, largely replaced India as the major entrepôt for luxuries from Asia, Africa, and the Mediterranean from the fourth through the tenth century. In 551 Procopius described how the early Byzantine emperor, Justinian, sought to break the Persian hold on the silk trade with the aid of the king of Axum in Ethiopia.[6] Around the same time, Cosmas Indicopleustes reported Persian traders muscling out Romans on his travels in Sri Lanka.[7] In the Middle Ages, merchants from the Caliphate of Baghdad (often Jewish) brought back pearls, spices, and eastern

3 George Fadlo Hourani, Arab Seafaring in the Indian Ocean in Ancient and Early Medieval Times ed. John Carswell (Princeton UP, 1995). For the dominance of Persians and Indians in Chinese trade during the Tang Dynasty (618-907), see Edward H. Schafer, The golden Peaches of Samarkand: A Study of T'ang Exotics (Berkeley: University of California, 1963), 11-25 and 222 ff. for gems. For Southern India in the medieval period, see Kenneth R. Hall, "International Trade and Foreign Diplomacy in Early Medieval Southern India," Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient 21/1 (Jan., 1978): 75-98.

4 The Periplus Maris Erythraei trans. and intro. Lionel Casson (Princeton UP, 1989), 56.26 and 61.19.

5 Kathleen Warner Slane, "Observations on Mediterranean Amphoras and Tablewares Found in India," in Rome and India: The Ancient Sea Trade ed. Vimala Begley and Richard Daniel De Puma (Madison, WI: U of Wisconsin, 1991), 212.

6 Procopius, Persian War, I.XX.

medicaments to Byzantium,[8] although they seem largely to have traded domestic lapis lazuli and turquoise further east, rather than west.[9] The Byzantines presumably could have continued to enjoy the transparent jewels of Asia that had bedazzled the Romans, such as rubies, emeralds and sapphires. These gems continue to figure in jeweled borders of mosaics or painting, and they never stop being noted as powerful stones from the East in Byzantine lapidaries.

The most direct conclusion is that the Byzantine move to carving saintly figures in more common stones entailed an economic or aesthetic choice. The tenth-century vogue to reset old Roman agate vessels, like the chalice of Romanos [Fig. 1], likely fits within a broader renaissance of Roman forms in tenth-century Byzantine society.[10] Because those vessels do not share the same material or workmanship with the corpus of Byzantine

---

7 Cosmas Indicopleustès, Topographie chrétienne ed. and trans. Wanda Wolska-Conus 159: Sources chrétiennes (Paris: CERF, 1970). This event normally is associated with the fall of the Jewish Himyarite kingdom to Ethiopia in 525. However, the Christian kings supported by Byzantium were ousted by a Persian client in 559. See Robert G. Hoyland, Arabia and the Arabs: From the Bronze Age to the Coming of Islam (London: Routledge, 2001), 51-57.

8 For Jewish trade networks, see the first-hand accounts in Jewish Travellers in the Middle Ages: 19 Firsthand Accounts ed. and intro. Elkan Nathan Adler (London: Routledge, 1930 repr. NY: Dover, 1987). A more recent historical assessment is Moshe Gil, "The Radhanite Merchants and the Land of Radhan," Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient 17/3 (Sep., 1974): 299-328, and idem., "The Jewish Merchants in Light of the Eleventh-Century Geniza Documents," Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient 46/3 (2003): 273-319. For medicaments, see Alain Touwaide, "Arabic Materia Medica in Byzantium during the 11th century A.D. and the Problems of Transfer of Knowledge in Medical Science," Science and Technology in the Islamic World 21 (2002): 232 ff. Byzantine knowledge of the East grew slowly through Arabic contacts in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Then, Byzantine medical MSS show a sudden expansion of contact with the Arabic-speaking east following 1261 according to Alain Touwaide, "Byzantine Hospital Manuals (Iatrosophia) as a Source for the Study of Therapeutics," The Medieval Hospital and Medical Practice ed. Barbara S. Bowers (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 164.

9 John Clarke, Jewellry of Tibet and the Himalayas (London: V & A, 2004), 35 ff.

10 Kurt Weitzmann, "Der Pariser Psalter Ms. 139 und die mittelbyzantinische Renaissance," Jahrbuch fur Kunstwissenschaft 6 N.S. (1939): 178-194. Ioli Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, "The Cup of San Marco and the 'Classical' in Byzantium," Studien zur mittelalterlichen Kunst, 800-1250: Festschrift für Florentine Mutherich zum 70. Geburtstag eds. Katharina Bierbrauer et al. (Munich: Prestel, 1985): 169-73. Henry Maguire, "Epigrams, Art, and the 'Macedonian Renaissance,'" DOP 48 (1994): 114-15.

cameos, they do not likely signal any grander ideological motivations for employing bloodstone so consistently for cameos. In addition, Byzantine artisans rarely reused Roman glyptics, as their Western Medieval counterparts conspicuously did. Transparent Byzantine cameos only seem to be produced again from the thirteenth century onwards, where their iconography also helps to assign them to the later Byzantine period. By contrast, the opaque cameos of the middle Byzantine period are relatively common stones, leaving their allure in imagery or artistry rather than exoticism or preciousness.

The form of Byzantine cameos also followed the genre of Roman gift jewelry, rather than the conventions of seals and magical charms. Where the latter genres often oriented an image or inscription laterally on a round, square or polygonal face, Byzantine cameos are invariably cabochons of around one inch in height (sometimes up to two inches), of a single vertical composition. In addition, nearly all Byzantine stones are positive images cut in relief, rather than the intaglios and seals that dominated Antique production. In only a few cases are Byzantine pieces of jewelry known to have incorporated Antique glyptics,[11] a practice common in the Medieval West.[12] Although the Crusaders brought the Gemma Augustea [Fig. 2] and Gemma Tiberiana from Constantinople to the West, the Byzantine plaque that once held the cameo of Tiberius has been lost. Verbal descriptions mention the mount's depiction of saints and inscriptions to

11 Cyril and Marlia Mundell Mango, "Cameos in Byzantium" in Cameos in Context: The Benjamin Zucker Lectures, 1990 ed. Martin Henig and Michael Vickers (Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1993): 58-60.

12 Antje Krug, "Antike Gemmen an mittelalterlichen Goldschmiedearbeiten im Kunstgewerbemuseum Berlin," Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen 37 (1995): 103-119. G. Sena Chiesa, "La 'Croce di Desiderio' a Brescia ed il problema del riuso glittico in età tardoantica ed altomedievale," in Splendida Civitas Nostra: Studi archeologici in onore di Antonio Frova eds. G. Cavalieri Manasse and E. Roffia (Rome: Quasar, 1995): 429-441. Erika Zwierlein-Diehl, Antike Gemmen und ihr Nachleben (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007).

the Evangelists.[13] A Roman cameo bust of Augustus also bears a Greek inscription that probably indicates its re-interpretation as one of the forty martyrs of Sebaste.[14] An imperial cameo of Honorius and Maria in the Rothschild Collection has added titles in Greek that designate the two figures as Ss. Sergius and Bacchus.[15] In the end though, nearly two hundred Byzantine glyptics either feature holy persons in cameos or on seals, while about thirty represent the gorgon on amulets. Almost all of the Byzantine cameos are small frontal figures of holy persons with identifying inscriptions. Only a handful bear inscriptions with names, have an archaeological provenance or remain in what might have been their original mount.

A useful point of comparison for Byzantine glyptics is the continuous record of tens of thousands of lead seals that survive from the early Byzantine period until the demise of the empire. While the low melting point of lead seals presumably caused many to be recycled, they survive in such great quantities as to reveal overall trends in Byzantine iconography. In general, data from lead seals indicate that religious figural iconography only became significant in the visual culture of the empire about the sixth or seventh century.[16] Only after Iconoclasm (730-843) did the percentage of figural imagery rise sharply to predominate on seals from the eleventh century until the Fall of Constantinople in 1453. Likewise, Christ, the Theotokos and saints begin to appear regularly on gems of

13 Henri Stern, "Pieresc et le Grand Camée de France," *La Revue des arts* 6 (1956): 255-56.

14 #62 in Le Tr*ésor de Saint-Denis: Musée du Louvre* (Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 1991). Blaise de Montesquiou-Fezensac and Danielle Gaborit-Chopin, "Camées et intailles du trésor de Saint-Denis," *Cahiers archéologiques* 24 (1975): 137-138.

15 Jutta Meischner, "Der Hochzeitskameo des Honorius," Archäologischer Anzeiger 4 (1993): 613-619. Étienne Coche de la Ferté, Le Camée Rothschild: un chef-d'oeuvre du Ive siècle après J.-C. (Paris: Librairie Laurent Tisné, 1957).

16 John Cotsonis, "The Contribution of Byzantine Lead Seals to the Study of the Cult of the Saints (Sixth-Twelfth Century)," Byzantion 75 (2005): 390-391.

the late-fifth century onwards, but they become the nearly exclusive subject of glyptic after Iconoclasm.

From early Byzantine times until the Fall of Constantinople, representations of Christ are the dominant subject of carved stones. Christ and the Theotokos, either figured separately or together, appear on over half of the religious figural glyptics of the Byzantine period proper (9th-15th centuries).[17] If one considers cameos of John the Baptist, who was the biblical cousin of Jesus; then depictions of Christ, his mother, and his cousin compose over half of all the published Byzantine carved gems. The enduring popularity of depictions of Christ, the Theotokos alone, the Theotokos and Christ Child, Crucifixion, and a smattering of scenes from Christ's life suggests that the Christocentric focus of Byzantine art remained the motivation for Byzantine glyptic from the early to the late periods of the tradition. This focus becomes even clearer in comparison with icons in other media, which featured a much broader range of saints than in glyptic. Individual depictions of Saints George, Demetrios, or Nicholas were equally popular in glyptic throughout various Byzantine periods, but in the aggregate, depictions of soldier saints were noticeably more popular than those of hierarchs or healers. Soldier saints account for under one fourth (43 of 188) of Byzantine glyptics, while hierarchs make up a scant eighth (23 of 188) of the same corpus. Only one stone depicts the early Christian healers, Cosmas and Damian, although a handful of small square steatite plaques of these saints seems to have been made to decorate larger icon panels during the middle and late Byzantine periods. Finally, the eight womb amulets that feature the gorgon on one side, and either an

17 My statistics include only steatite cameos or enkolpia comparable to gems, not square icons of larger sizes that might compare of icons in ivory or other media.

inscription or saint or both on the other side, form a small percentage of the total corpus of over one hundred and seventy cameos.[18] The lack of narrative scenes on Byzantine cameos also is conspicuous compared with Byzantine seals carved in gemstones, a quarter of which feature narratives from the life of Christ or the Theotokos (11 of 47).[19] St. Theodore and mounted saints are popular on gemstone seals as well.

What emerges from a statistical survey of Byzantine glyptics is the general visual conformity of Byzantine cameos to the conventions of the icon. The conspicuous number of bishops and the lack of physician saints represented does not support a thematic continuity of the therapeutic aims that some scholars claim for Byzantine glyptics.[20] In fact, the cameos formally compare with the large number of middle Byzantine stone icons that survive in larger formats, from hand-held works in steatite to nearly life-sized marble icons incorporated into church façades.[21] Scholars have noted the proliferation of saints beyond Christ and the Theotokos in visual sources of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, which is precisely the period of diffusion of standardized saints lives.[22] Engraved stones

18 Spier, "Medieval Byzantine Magical Amulets and Their Tradition," Journal of the Warburg & Courtauld Institutes 56 (1993): 25-62.

19 Jeffrey Spier, "Middle Byzantine Stamp Seals," in Through a Glass Brightly: Studies in Byzantine and Medieval Art and Archaeology Presented to David Buckton ed. Chris Entwistle (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2003): 114-15.

20 Gary Vikan, "Art, Medicine and Magic in Early Byzantium," DOP 38 (1984): 75-81. Genevra Kornbluth, "Intaglios & Cameos," in Sacred Art, Secular Context ed. Asen Kirin (Athens, GA: Georgia Museum of Art, 2005), 56 ff.

21 Reinhold Lange, Die byzantinische Reliefikone (Recklinghausen: Aurel Bongers, 1964). Ioli Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, Byzantine Icons in Steatite (Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1985). Bissera V. Pentcheva, "Moving Eyes: Surface and shadow in the Byzantine mixed-media relief icon," Res 55-56 (Spring-Autumn, 2009): 222-34.

22 Christopher Walter, "'Latter-Day' Saints in the Model for the London and Barberini Psalters," Revue des Études Byzantines 46 (1988): 212-14. Nancy Ševčenko, Illustrated Manuscripts of the Metaphrastian Menologion (U of Chicago, 1990). John Cotsonis. "The Contribution of Byzantine Lead Seals to the Study of the Cult of the Saints (Sixth-Twelfth Century)." Byzantion 75 (2005): 383-497.

reveal a corresponding diversification of saints and increase in depictions of St. Michael, St. Theodore, and St. Nicholas. Since this study counts each appearance of a subject when two or more figures appear on a stone, many of these numbers simply reflect the eleventh-century shift to representing multiple soldier saints together. Theodore the General often appears alongside the recruit, although their cult may have originally been dedicated to a single Theodore.[23] Another soldier saint, St. George, maintained a steady presence on engraved stones without any indication that he bore particularly amuletic properties. The miracle at Chonae likely accounts for the popularity of St. Michael in the Byzantine period, although he always possessed supernatural power from the simple fact that he was reckoned the leader of the angelic hosts.[24] However, the jump in number of representations of the Mother of God alone or the Theotokos and Child echoes recent studies that suggest she acquired new supernatural significance in the Byzantine period, as imperial patronage focused on icons of the Theotokos.[25] Overall, though, the Komnenian increase in depictions of the Mother of God or certain soldier saints did not so much displace the number of dominical images being produced as augment their numbers.

In the case of seals, Cotsonis argues cogently from inscriptions that the proliferation of lesser saints from the eleventh century onward is an indication of individualization, which would make the seals more useful for their intended purpose of trade. Where engraved gems depart from seals and follow icons is exactly in their lack of

23 John Cotsonis, "The Contribution of Byzantine Lead Seals to the Study of the Cult of the Saints (Sixth-Twelfth Century)," Byzantion 75 (2005): 454-56. Cotsonis ably summarizes the previous literature.

24 Glenn Peers, Subtle Bodies: Representing Angels in Byzantium (Berkeley: University of California, 2001), 157 ff.

25 Bissera V. Pentcheva, Icons and Power: The Mother of God in Byzantium (University Park: Penn State UP, 2006).

individualization. Out of almost two hundred engraved Byzantine stones only half a dozen contain an invocation: three to imperial men [Cat. 6, Fig. 15] [Cat. 14, Fig. 10] [Cat. 102, Figs. 22-23], one to an imperial woman [Cat. 1, Fig. 11] and one to an otherwise unidentified Matthew [Fig. 81].[26] If engraved gems were associated primarily with an owner's name saint, then one would expect to find a predominance of various saints in specific times or places. The modest increase in representations of soldier saints in the eleventh century may be explained this way, as well as the sudden Palaiologan popularity of the apostle, James, and the prophet, Daniel. However, the increase in name saints does not come close to rivaling the spike in depictions of the Mother of God in the Komnenian period. The almost total lack of dedicatory inscriptions and the relatively generic compositions of saints in bust suggest that Byzantine glyptics were stock items of enterprising jewelers, rather than personal treasures imbued with mystic significance.

Transition from Antique to Byzantine Glyptic

By contrast with the literary and archaeological sources of late Antiquity, only one early Byzantine cameo clearly associates the natural power of a stone with supernatural healing. It is the supposed hematite in New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art that depicts Christ healing a woman of a twelve-year hemorrhage, while on his way to raise the dead daughter of Jairus, a local synagogue leader [Cat. 33, Figs. 3].[27] The healing of the hemorrhoissa was commonly represented in late Antiquity, but after Iconoclasm it usually

26 The steatite enkolpion of Christ Pantokrator dug from a Komnenian layer at Corinth reads, "Lord help Thy servant Matthew, the monk. Amen," #706 in Everyday Life in Byzantium. See too the generic invocations on a Macedonian era bloodstone of Christ Pantokrator in the Hermitage [Cat. 20], as well as on a Palaiologan onyx of St. Theodore slaying the Hydra in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York [Cat. 171].

27 The primary accounts are found in the synoptic Gospels of Mathew 9:20-22, Mark 5:25-34, and Luke 8:43-48.

illuminates sacred texts.[28] When her healing re-appears in the late Byzantine churches of Christ in Chora, Istanbul (finished c. 1321), and Dečani, Serbia (finished 1350), the episode may owe some of its popularity to the subject's continuous representation in the medieval West, such as in the Sicilian cathedral at Monreale.[29]

The three surviving early Byzantine examples of Christ Healing the Hemorrhoissa in glyptic are cut in disparate materials and remain difficult to date precisely: one in rock crystal, one in plasma, and one likely in hematite. The rock crystal intaglio [Fig. 5] belongs to a handful of those stones that feature scenes from the life of Christ, which compares closely in style to glyptics of the later sixth or early seventh centuries.[30] It represents the rare narrative context of Jairus, the synagogue leader, raising his hand in a gesture to speak to Christ from His left side at the very moment that the afflicted woman reaches down amid the crowd to touch His hem from His right side. This narrative framework of the healings and its connection to an early Byzantine interest in portraying events from the life of Christ is a strong argument for dating the cameo in the Metropolitan Museum of New York to the period before Iconoclasm. Compared to small arts of the early Byzantine

28 Sacra Parallela, Paris, BnF gr. 923 f.212r.; Khludov Psalter, Moscow, Historical Museum D.129 f.84v; Paris Gregory, Paris, BnF gr. 510 f.143v; Barberini Psalter, Vatican, Barberini gr. 372 f.145v and 187v; Karahissar Gospels, St. Petersburg, Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library gr. 105 f.79r.; Rockefeller-McCormick New Testament, Chicago, U of Chicago Goodspeed 965 f.43r; Hamilton Greek Psalter, Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin 78A9, Hamilton 119 f.193v; Gospels of Tsar Ivan Alexander, London, BL Add. Ms. 39627 f.29r, f.100r & f.163r.

29 Gertrud Schiller, "Das blutflüssige Weib (Haemoroissa)," in Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst 1: Inkarnation-Kindheit-Taufe-Versuchung-Verklärung-Wirken und Wunder Christi (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1966), 187.

30 This rock crystal intaglio is inventory no. 307 in the American Numismatic Society collection, New York (#683 in Spier, Late Antique and Early Christian Gems). Spier discusses this gem and similar ones in, Late Antique and Early Christian Gems, 119-123. He classifies another ambiguous rock crystal in the British Museum (#686 in Spier) as the Healing of the Blind Man, which Genevra Kornbluth had categorized as a Hemorrhoissa, #23 in "'Early Byzantine' Crystals: An Assessment," Journal of the Walters Art Gallery 52/53 (1994/95): 23-29. However, the figure to the right of Christ is not kneeling toward His hem and holds a staff indicative of the Blind Man in iconography of this period. A stepped cross is placed on His left hand, as in another contemporary Healing of the Blind Man (#685 in Spier).

period, narrative scenes in glyptic are noticeably absent from works of the middle Byzantine period. Only three to five stones from the tenth to fifteenth century serve to represent standard events from the life of Christ, such as the Annunciation, Crucifixion, and Nativity, that were so popular earlier.

The stylistically similar prase intaglio in the Benaki Museum of Athens [Fig. 6] suggests that the medico-magical overtones of the iconography became unacceptable on the eve of Iconoclasm.[31] The scene of Christ healing the Hemorrhoissa on the convex face of the stone is cut in the same spare, late Antique style as the Crucifixion on the back. The Crucifixion of Christ in a kolobion was current from the sixth until the ninth century. Its depiction on the flat reverse of the gem almost certainly means that it was cut after the main scene of the Hemorrhoissa, because it would prove awkward to mount the convex face of such a chunky stone into a ring or pendant. The Crucifixion is cut in the same late Antique style as Christ healing the Hemorrhoissa, but it was a sober public image opposed to the medico-magical connotations of the original scene. The gem's translucence is certainly more characteristic of what scholars call prase than of what we today label bloodstone, although Roman and Byzantine texts only speak vaguely of "green stones." The gem's lack of an inscription also might have been embarrassing in the theological climate that emerged around the time of Byzantine Iconoclasm.[32] Inscriptions and normative attributes for age, sex, profession, and rank emerged from these debates to define Byzantine sacred iconography. Neither of the gem's iconographies would have fit

31 Anastasia Drandaki, #659 in Everyday Life in Byzantium ed. Demetra Papanikola-Bakirtzi (Athens: Kapon, 2002), 485.

32 Henry Maguire, The Icons of their Bodies: Saints and their Images in Byzantium (Princeton UP, 1996), 137-144.

easily into the official priorities of Byzantine iconography as they were developed during or after Iconoclasm.

As a double-sided intaglio with inscriptions that accompany the Hemorrhoissa, the supposed hematite cameo in New York [Cat. 33, Fig. 3] probably derives from the end of Iconoclasm.[33] On the obverse a veiled figure kneels to touch Christ's robe flanked by an inscription that reads: "After much suffering and expense the woman's bleeding not only continued but flowed rather more intensely." On the reverse [Cat. 33, Fig. 4] a similar veiled female figure stands with arms raised between two stylized palm trees flanked by an inscription that reads: "The source of her bleeding dried up on account of her faith." The stone is mainly a dark crimson with deep green occlusions on the edge. However, the conchoidal fracture near the top edge is typical of harder cryptocrystalline stones, like bloodstone, and not generally consistent with either the friable fracture of botryoidal hematite or the uneven fracture of specular hematite.[34] However, its publication in connection with an influential exhibition linked its subject to "the magical powers attributed to hematite," leading to a spate of similar confused conclusions.[35] The first real

33 #6 in Sacred Art, Secular Context, refers to it as bloodstone but cites #165, Byzantine Women and Their World ed. Ioli Kalavrezou (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Art Museums, 2003) as evidence of bloodstone's Byzantine meaning as medical-magical. The latter catalog seems to confuse bloodstone with hematite. Adolph A. Barb, "Lapis Adamas – Der Blutstein," in Latomus: Hommages *à Marcel Renard* 101(1969): 66-82, argues forcefully for ancient awareness of the difference between hematite and bloodstone, although they had similar styptic properties in Roman medicine.

34 I am grateful to Dr. Michael Lane for pointing this out to me and for sharing references to works on the geology of Greece.

35 #398, Age of Spirituality ed. Kurt Weitzmann (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1979), 440. #165, Sp*ä*tantike und fr*ü*hes Christentum ed. H. Beck and P.C. Bol (Frankfurt am Main: Museum alter Plastik, 1983), also labels it hematite from 6-7th c. Vikan, "Art, Medicine, and Magic in Early Byzantium," 81 nn. 104-106, elided hematite and bloodstone based on what he viewed originally as late Antique syncretism of Chnoubis and Medusa. His more specific argument regarding marriage materials found in Vikan, "Art and Marriage in Early Byzantium," DOP 44 (1990): 156 n. 87, corrects the confusion by claiming that the hemorrhoissa in the Metropolitan Museum of Art is a heliotrope, that is bloodstone.

study designates it as a bloodstone and argues that it is a middle Byzantine work against earlier dating to the seventh century.[36]

The reverse scene of the Theotokos between flanking palms certainly is unusual. It appears on a tenth-century enkolpion of lapis lazuli in the Louvre and four glass cameos that have been assumed to be of late twelfth or thirteenth century origin, perhaps Venetian.[37] However, the fat snaky palms pictured on the reverse of the Metropolitan intaglio compare more closely to early Byzantine works, such as the Visitation of the Virgin on the ring in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection [Fig. 8][38] or the Ascension figured on the tenth-century pectoral cross from Vicopisano [Fig. 9].[39] In general, the style of the Metropolitan Hemorrhoissa does not correspond to Spier's early Byzantine hematite group or rock crystal group, where the massing of angular cuts alone forms figures or dominates their surface. On the other hand, the Benaki palimpsest intaglio [Figs.6-7] is cut in a similar technique that reinforces its date before Iconoclasm. Even if Spier's hypothetical association of this technique with the Levant holds for the sixth century, the style only appears after Iconoclasm in one Byzantine stone, an emerald set within a signet ring of around 865-66 [Cat. 14, Fig. 10].

---

36 Spier, "Medieval Byzantine Magical Amulets and Their Tradition," 44 n. 111. #165 in Byzantine Women and Their World labels the stone a hematite but accepts Spier's Middle Byzantine dating.

37 For enkolpion see #195 in Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises. For glass cameos see "Maria Orans," #2424, #6388 in Mittelalterliche Bildwerke aus Italien und Byzanz ed. Wolfgang Friedrich Volbach 2nd ed. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1930), 127; #37 in Collection H*élène Stathatos* 2: *Les objets byzantins et post-byzantins* (Strasbourg, 1953); #218 in Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises.

38 Marvin C. Ross ed., Catalogue of the Byzantine and Early Mediaeval Antiquities in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection 2nd ed. Susan A. Boyd and Stephen R. Zwirn (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 2005), no. 69 pl. XLIV.

39 Ernst Kitzinger, "Reflections on the Feast Cycle in Byzantine Art." Cahiers archéologiques 36 (1988): 65. Brigitte Pitarakis, Les croix-reliquaires pectorales byzantines en bronze XVI: Bibliotheque des cahiers archeologiques (Paris: Picard, 2006), 63-65.

By contrast, the Metropolitan Museum of Art intaglio does compare well to an eighth- or ninth-century deesis engraved on the reverse of an early Byzantine sardonyx in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris [Cat. 1, Fig. 11].[40] The scene of the Annunciation on the obverse generally is accepted as one of several examples like it from the early Byzantine period. As a middle Byzantine iconography, the depiction of the Deesis on the reverse must be more recent than the typically early Byzantine Annunciation on the obverse. The style of cutting is reminiscent of Carolingian rock crystal's sinuous curves[41], as well as of the simplified bodily volumes found in Byzantine stamp seals more generally.[42]

Another gem to which the New York Hemorrhoissa has been compared is the amethyst of Christ now in the Dumbarton Oaks collection [Fig. 12], who holds a scroll and gestures with two fingers extended, perhaps in blessing or to signal speech. Its composition and style echo the Ascended Christ of the Rabula Gospels, which can be dated by colophon to 586, although it was heavily painted over around the turn of the sixteenth century [Fig. 13].[43] The peculiar chrismon in Christ's nimbus also suggests an

---

40 Hans Wentzel, "Die Kamee der Kaiserin Anna: zur Datierung byzantinisierender Intaglien," in Festschrift Ulrich Middeldorf (Berlin, 1968), 1-11, suggests that the Anna inscribed on the reverse is the daughter of the Iconoclastic emperor, Theophilos (829-843). A strong iconographical argument for the Deesis as a ninth- or tenth-century gem is made in #184 in Byzance: l'art byzantin dans les collections publiques fran*çaises* (Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 1992). Cyril and Marlia Mundell Mango, "Cameos in Byzantium," Cameos in Context: The Benjamin Zucker Lectures, 1990 ed. Martin Henig and Michael Vickers (Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1993), 65, n. 53, also doubt Babelon's suggestion that this is Anna Komnena, which would place the intaglio in the twelfth century.

41 Hans Wentzel, "Der Bergkristall mit der Geschichte der Susanna," Pantheon 28 (1970): 370, but compare the doubts of Genevra Kornbluth, Engraved Gems of the Carolingian Empire (University Park: Pennsylvania State U, 1995), 13 n. 38-39.

42 Jeffrey Spier, "Middle Byzantine (10th-13th AD) Stamp Seals in Semi-Precious Stone," in Through a Glass Brightly: Studies in Byzantine and Medieval Art and Archaeology Presented to David Buckton ed. Chris Entwistle (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2003), 114-126.

43 Massimo Bernabò ed., Il Tretravangelo di Rabbula: Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 1.56 (Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 2008), 50-56.

early Byzantine date, as the style of that gem is almost unique among Byzantine gems.[44] The plastically rendered forearm of Christ that rises up from the ground is a striking example of its idiosyncrasy. The Byzantine use of amethyst would seem most logical before the Islamic conquest of the Levant in 635, as these stones generally are associated with Rome's Indian trade since the second century – a trade that was increasingly squeezed by merchants from the Persian Gulf during late Antiquity.[45] However, gems from south Asia appear in early Medieval work as late as the seventh century.[46] Because the Washington amethyst follows the very graphic style of late Antique glyptic, it also is difficult to imagine it among the Byzantine amethyst cameos of rather ovoid figures in high, convex relief that typically are attributed to the late Byzantine period.

The closest comparison for this transitional style of graphic intaglio, perhaps, is the so-called Zeus type bust of Christ with a shaggy mien that appeared first in Byzantine coinage on the obverse of a gold solidus during the first reign of Emperor Justinian II (685-95) [Fig. 14]. It also portrays Christ with a cross and no nimbus, an iconography which reappears only one more time, on the solidus of Michael III (r. 843-867), before Christ assumes the standard crossed nimbus of the Byzantine period. The physiognomy of Christ on the Metropolitan Museum of Art bloodstone [Cat. 33, Fig. 3] lacks the dangling forelock apparent on coinage, but it and the onyx Deesis in Paris [Cat. 1, Fig. 11] both

44 Genevra Kornbluth, "Intaglio with Standing Christ," #1 in Sacred Art, Secular Context ed. Asen Kirin (Athens, GA: Georgia Museum of Art, 2005), 57.

45 James A. Harrell et al. "The Ptolemaic to Early Roman Amethyst Quarry at Abu Diyeiba in Egypt's Eastern Desert," Bulletin de l'Institut français de archéologie orientale 106 (2006): 149-150. On the poor quality of Egyptian amethyst, see Steven E. Sidebotham, Martin Hense and Hendrikje M. Nouwens, The Red Land (American University of Cairo, 2007), 284.

46 T. Calligaro, "The Origin of Ancient Gemstones Unveiled by PIXE, PIGE and μ-Raman Spectrometry," in X-Rays for Archaeology eds. M. Uda, G. Demortier, I. Nakai (Dordrecht: Springer, 2005): 108-11.

emphasize the long, straight strands of hair and the heavy brow of the coin portrait. Its style, narrative interest, and biblical inscriptions all suggest that the Hemorrhoissa in the Metropolitan Museum, like the Deesis in Paris, is a transitional work that begins to incorporate the sensibilities of middle Byzantine art, as it was emerging from the debates over religious Iconoclasm in 730-787 and 815-843.

Given the increasingly divisive nature of icons in Byzantium, what is interesting about these Hemorrhoissa gems is precisely that they came to an end in the middle Byzantine period and that Medusa amulets replaced them as an all-purpose amulet. The exceptional iconography and varied stones of these Hemorrhoissa gems undermine the intuition that they form a "missing link" between Antique magic, medicine, and Byzantine jewelry.[47] What such idiosyncratic items do suggest, however, is that a middle Byzantine patron of the arts would have to possess the arcane knowledge preserved in bookish circles in order to appreciate such an object after Iconoclasm during the middle Byzantine period. The few who possessed such knowledge in middle Byzantine times were the first to warn their readers of making too much of Greco-Roman literary connections with everyday Byzantine culture. While Byzantine scholars certainly brought their own Christian reservations to interpreting pre-Christian material, their wariness should make the modern scholar likewise careful about symbolic readings of Byzantine works or Byzantine intentions.

Style and Dating of Middle Byzantine Cameos

Despite speculation regarding the function or meaning of Byzantine cameos, the

47 John Cotsonis, "The Contribution of Byzantine Lead Seals to the Study of the Cult of the Saints (Sixth-Twelfth Century)," Byzantion 75 (2005): 401-402.

few articles and encyclopedia entries that have drawn attention to them have concentrated on the vexed question of dating. Dating has been solely stylistic thus far, with some modest comments on iconography. Only recently have exhibition catalogs provided color photographs and consistent measurements of thickness, in addition to height and width. Almost no publications offer gemological evidence for the designation of the stones themselves. Although many of the cameos have been in major museum collections since the early twentieth century or earlier, they probably have not been analyzed with modern tools or familiarity with modern gemological literature. Of the half a dozen American and European collections to which I have gained access, only one appeared to evince a scratch test to determine hardness – a standard test of gemstones since Roman times.[48] Streak testing has been widely applied since Roman times,[49] and specific gravity testing was prevalent in the Indian centers of jewelry production that supplied Rome.[50] Recent gemological studies on Roman intaglios are only beginning to provide a physical-chemical basis for locating the exact source of ancient gems, usually in India and Sri Lanka.[51] By comparison, the study of Indo-Pacific beads provides an important recent example of integrated archaeological, art-historical, and literary-historical analysis of portable goods

48 Pliny knew roughly that a scale of hardness existed among stones, much like that Mohs formulated in the nineteenth century. Diamond (Mohs 10) cuts anything, while transparent gems cut most other stones (rubies [9], sapphires [9], topaz [8], emeralds [7 ¾], garnets [7 ¾]). Opaque stones, such as varieties of quartz (7) and chalcedony (6 ½-7) (agate, carnelian/sard, bloodstone), cut turquoise and lapis lazuli. Although granites can be as hard as Mohs 7, most marbles are a hardness of Mohs 3. Iron tools were around Mohs 5 ½–6, a fact which required a mix of techniques and tools to quarry hard decorative stones in Egypt.

49 See the distinction between magnetite and hematite by Pliny, Orphic Lapidary and medical writers discussed above.

50 Arun Kumar Biswas, Minerals and Metals in Ancient India 2: Indigenous Literary Evidence, 69 ff.

51 Lisbet Thoresen, "Ancient Glyptic Art," http://ancient-gems.lthoresen.com, accessed September 27, 2013.

that illustrates trade networks from the Mediterranean through Indian ports to the South China Sea in the first millennium of the Christian era.[52]

Dating Byzantine cameos stylistically, therefore, also raises basic questions about trade and the lapidary industry to help group material chronologically. My own examination of Byzantine gems has been restricted mainly to magnification of a hand-held lens (that is, a x10 jeweler's loupe). The current research consequently addresses questions mostly of signification and cultural meaning within the current discourse of Byzantine art history. In his pioneering studies of Byzantine cameos, Hans Wentzel began quite reasonably with those pieces that are datable by inscription or historical record.[53] He does not seem to have been concerned with the trickle of magical gems that were beginning to come from archaeological digs, but his work remains an important attempt to organize the unwieldy corpus of material stylistically. As he noted several generations ago, roughly datable Byzantine gems number somewhere around a dozen, and only a handful have inscriptions. The main line of inquiry therefore has tried to compare Byzantine glyptic to other materials in search of period styles, without much success. One immediately sees that the technique of Byzantine cameos is distinct from Roman intaglios and late Antique cameos,[54] although Byzantine jewelers continued to engrave seals in a technique similar to

52 Peter Francis, Jr. Asia's Maritime Bead Trade: 300 BC to the Present (Honolulu: U of Hawaii, 2002), esp. 27-41. See also the broader survey of Himanshu P. Ray, The Winds of Change: Buddhism and the Maritime Links of Early South Asia (Delhi: Oxford UP, 1994).

53 Hans Wentzel, "Datierte und datierbare byzantinische Kameen," Festschrift Friedrich Winkler ed. Hans Möhle (Berlin: Verl. Gebr. Mann, 1959): 9-21. Idem., "Die byzantinischen Kameen in Kassel: Zur Problematik der Datierung byzantinischer Gemmen," Mouseion: Studien aus Kunstgeschichte *für Otto H. Foster* ed. Heinz Ladendorf and Horst Vey (Cologne: M. DuMont Schauberg, 1960): 88-96.

54 Genevra Kornbluth, Engraved Gems of the Carolingian Empire (University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1995), 10-13, and Jeffrey Spier, Late Antique and Early Christian Gems (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2007), #.

late Antique intaglios. Because Byzantine cameos are truly carved in a new, sculptural style, the question has been where this style came from and how widely it circulated among the other Byzantine crafts.

At the end of the ninth century, Byzantine glyptic displays a sudden change from positive images cut in intaglio to those cut in relief, where positive and negative refer to how the image appears to the beholder. Positive images and lettering are formed to be legible to the beholder, whereas negative images are reversed in order to appear correct when they are impressed into a soft material. In Antiquity traditions of flat carving, relief, and fully round sculpture were highly developed for all manner of stone, ranging from gems to monumental sculpture. After Iconoclasm one continues to find gemstone seals, distinguishable by their tall handles and negative images, cut just like they had been in Antiquity.[55] Coins and lead seals continued to be struck from matrices carved in reverse just as they had been before. Marble parapets continued to be carved with Antique rosettes, swirls, vegetation and birds long after Iconoclasm. For reasons that remain unclear though, jewelers stopped carving gemstones in the intaglio technique for jewelry and began to cut small relief portraits of saints in a style normally associated with monumental works.

The double-sided onyx intaglio now in the Cabinet des Médailles, Paris [Cat. 1, Fig. 11], inscribed to an Anna, is probably from the second quarter of the ninth century and represents the end of intaglio cameos as the customary form of glyptic.[56] The depiction of the Annunciation in sardonyx relief on what must be its obverse is a typical

55 Spier, "Byzantine Stamp Seals," 114-15.

56 #184 in Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises. Wentzel, "Die Kamee der Kaiserin Anna," 4-5.

example of a small group of cameos from the sixth or seventh centuries.[57] Like earlier imperial cameos in sardonyx, the figures are cut from a light layer against a dark ground. Here they are cut in a blocky style associated with late Antique carving.[58] The reverse bears an early depiction of the Deesis cut in intaglio into the black layer of onyx. Because the obverse already was cut in relief, it is difficult to know the extent to which the choice to cut the bust of Christ in intaglio signals an iconophile aesthetic, a new start to figuration after Iconoclasm, or the exigency of the craft. After all, jewelers continued to cut matrices for figured coinage and some figured lead seals throughout periods of Iconoclasm, so they remained familiar with intaglio as a craft. Intaglio gem cutting continued in positive images for a time, while cutting negative images in gems died out with the obsolescence of signet rings, which were replaced by lead seals. Then intaglio glyptic was replaced with a new aesthetic.

Another example of intaglio in this transitional period is mounted in a signet ring that presumably is original. The crude intaglio bust of Christ reportedly is cut in emerald, although chrome tourmaline is a similar stone that was popular in late Antiquity and sometimes mistaken for emerald.[59] The inscription to "Basil Parakoimomenos" [Cat. 14, Fig. 10] may well be that of Basil I Macedonian from around 865-66, just before he became the sole emperor in 867.[60] The slashed ends of the cross that radiates from Christ's

57 Spier, Catalogue of Late Antique and Early Christian Cameos, 142 n. 101.

58 Lila Marangou, Bone Carvings from Egypt (Tübingen: Wasmuth, 1976), 81-82. Elizabeth Rodziewicz, "Ivory, bone, glass, and other production at Alexandria, 5th–9th centuries," in Byzantine Trade, 4th–12th Centuries: The Archaeology of Local, Regional and International Exchange ed. Marlia Mundell Mango (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2009), 89-91.

59 Lisbet Thoresen, "Ancient Glyptic Art," http://ancient-gems.lthoresen.com, accessed September 27, 2013.

60 #219 in Byzance. Wentzel, "Datierte und datierbare byzantinische Kameen," 13-14 fig. 8.

head and the downward pointed-arch of the schematic beard both are typical of representations from the late seventh until the late ninth centuries, such as the contemporary Deesis intaglio of Princess Anna.

In the finely carved sard dedicated to "Despot Leo" [Cat. 6, Fig. 15] around the turn of the tenth century one already sees a mature style of sculpture that values plastic modeling of facial features and a generally monumental conception of relief.[61] The way that the dais on which Christ stands breaks the lower lip of the cameo and that an arch tops the cameo immediately draw comparisons with ivories, such as the Romanos Ivory.[62] Such traits signal a new conception of the Byzantine cameo not so much as personal adornment, as a personal icon.

This monumental conception of relief as sculpture largely consists of single figures against a blank ground, often on a simple dais or cushion. The artisan presumably outlined the figure on the block and then excavated the material around it. Then, he likely worked the material away from the high points of the figure and engraved surface details, before polishing his tool marks from the surface of the sculpture. In glyptic a rotating disc seems to have been the only tool employed during the middle Byzantine period. Points and chisels were the standard tools for working stone. Knives and drills were used on ivory, and likely steatite. The centralized compositions of this statuesque style would have been quicker and more convenient to cut than narrative scenes, and single figures do not need to be undercut or drilled. Indeed, one finds this general taste for plain compositions and plastic forms in the sunken enamels, ivories, glyptics and marble reliefs of the Macedonian

61 #126 in The Glory of Byzantium, 174-75. It seems unlikely that an authentic work that invokes help for Leo VI (886-912) would be crafted a generation later, as the catalog entry asserts.

62 #140 in ibid., 203-4. #68 in Byzantium, 330-1453, 397-98.

period. Already in the Romanos ivory (c. 946) [Fig. 16], an interest in elaborating the compositional elements and the surface of the work appears, an interest that grows in metalwork in the eleventh century and even influences architectural sculpture up until the Fourth Crusade. At the same time, Byzantine cameos show little influence from these general changes in taste.

Two of the most significant Byzantine cameos receive scant attention, perhaps because their sharply-cut schematic style is surprising on objects from the turn of the eleventh century. The king of Germany, Henry II, gave Bamberg cathedral the Gospelbook of Otto III in 1007 or 1012 and a sumptuous reliquary of the True Cross between 1014-1024.[63] The bloodstone cameo inscribed to "John the Theologian" (the Evangelist) [Cat. 95, Fig. 17] sits at the top of the cover to the Ottonian Gospelbook, depicting the saint cradling a book in both hands. The bloodstone cameo inscribed to St. Paul [Cat. 104, Fig. 18] sits on the bottom of the reliquary's frame and depicts the saint clutching a book in his left hand while he gestures with his open right hand, perhaps to address or direct the beholder. They presumably are Byzantine because the inscriptions are in Greek. Their style is more graphic than sculptural, although the rotated profile of the figures and the way they hold their books is reminiscent of ivories assigned to the late tenth century. The most distinctive feature, though, is how the eyes are formed by cutting around a large pupil. In Byzantine ivories and steatites, the pupil also is drilled out to create a convincing eye and eyelids. On the other hand, these cameos find their best comparison in the ivory plaque around 986 of Otto II and Theophano crowned by Christ

63 Martin Dennert, #41 "Kameo: Johannes der Evangelist," and idem., # "Kreuzreliquiar Henrichs II.: Kameo mit heiligem Paulus," in Rom und Byzanz: Schatzkammerstücke aus bayerischen Sammlungen ed. Reinhold Baumstark with Birgitt Borkopp, Rainer Kahsnitz, Marcell Restle et al. (Munich: Hirmer Vlg., 1998).

[Fig.19]. Since many scholars have seen this ivory as a provincial work of southern Italy, it is worth reconsidering the provenance of the cameos.

In assessing the rich collection of cameos at Kassel, Hans Wentzel compared several of them to the bloodstone of the Evangelist John [Cat. 95, Fig. 17] and St. Paul in Munich [Cat. 104, Fig. 18], which he considered stylistically similar.[64] By comparison with Munich's John [Cat. 95, Fig. 17], the indistinct features of John the Evangelist in Kassel [Cat. 93, Fig. 20] certainly share the more rounded profile of later Byzantine cameos, such as the medallion of Nikephoros III Botaneiates [Cat. 37, Fig. 21] and the double-sided cameo of Alexios V Doukas [Cat.102, Figs. 22-23]. The small group of double-sided Byzantine cameos seems both stylistically and iconographically to date around the turn of the thirteenth century.[65] The members of the group demonstrate the same tendency to schematize hair into polyhedral patches or drapery into thick, parallel cuts. None of these cameos, though, reduces the eyes and nose into big knobs like those of the Evangelist John in Kassel [Cat. 93, Fig. 20]. Since the composition of the Kassel example closely follows the gem of St. Paul that came to the Ottonian court around 1000, the circumstances suggest the possibility that this cameo is a later Western imitation – how much later remains a question for scholars of Western Medieval glyptic.

A double-side cameo of Christ and Gregory the Theologian in Krakow [Cat. 3, Fig. 24] demonstrates the continuity of this graphic style into the Komnenian period, probably in greater Bulgaria. The inscription appears traced with a sharper stone than bloodstone, which was a Roman technique documented in the Carolingian West on but

64 Wentzel, Byzantinische Kameen in Kassel, 90-91.

65 Wassilij Putzko, "Die zweiseitge Kamee in der Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore," in Beiträge zur Kunst des Mittelalters: Festschrift für Hans Wentzel zum 60. Geburtstag (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1975), 179.

not documented in the Byzantine East.[66] The style of outlining the lettering is reminiscent of eleventh and twelfth century Byzantine metalwork. The "I" of GREGORI has a slight descending serif on the right corner of the lower crossbar that finds its best comparisons in Slavonic bookhands of the twelfth century, as does an ascending serif on the g of ΟΘΕΟΛΟΓΟC (o theologos). The spelling of ΟΓΡΙΓΟΡΙ (o grigori), without a final os, follows Old Slavic pronunciations.[67] However, this spelling also could result from beginning the lettering of the saint's name in letters too large to comfortably accommodate the Greek ending of his name, since only the name is outlined. The different form of lettering for the title suggests that the title may have been cut at a later time by an artisan with Greek skills. Myśliński ascribes the gem either to Venice or Rus', but the style and lettering are unlike anything in medieval Russia. Its style and mix of Slavonic and Greek presumably comes from the Greek-controlled Balkan provinces of twelfth-century Bulgaria.

Although Byzantine cameos consist largely of greenish works in jasper, steatite, and similar stones, the Byzantine examples in banded agate and sardonyx are important to establish the transition from middle to late Byzantine style. Many multilayered examples in onyx and sardonyx appear to reflect a Western Medieval context from the Hohenstaufen court, and few of them can be ascribed with confidence to Byzantine circles. The best example of a Byzantine sardonyx is the Paris cameo of a bust-length

66 Genevra Kornbluth, Engraved Gems of the Carolingian Empire (Princeton UP, 1995), 10-13.

67 #551 and 553 in Andrei A. Zalizniak, Drevnenovgorodskii dialekt [The Old Novgorod Dialect] 2nd ed. (Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoi kul'tury, 2004), 466. These birchbark scraps come from stratum B-II in Novgorod, dated to about 1160-1220.

Christ crowning Ss. George and Demetrios in armor [Cat. 83, Fig. 25].[68] The composition is reminiscent of the frontispiece of Christ crowning Emperor Nikephoros III Botaneiates [Fig. 26] (1078-1081) and a manuscript illumination of Christ crowning John II and Alexios Komnenos [Fig. 27] (c. 1128)[69] in a luxury Gospelbook. Based on its delicate figure style and careful cutting, the cameo has been identified as a product of the Komnenian dynasty's exquisite taste. However, the kite-shaped shield of St. George and triangular shield of St. Demetrios together suggest a dating in the late twelfth century at the earliest.[70] It is necessary to look closely to how the latter shield terminates sharply against the saint's hand with no curve behind it in order to distinguish the two styles of shield. As Parani demonstrates in datable frescoes, the so-called kite-shaped shield that is often associated with the Norman invasions of England and Italy becomes common in Byzantine representations of about 1059 onwards [Fig. 28]. This form, perhaps, resembles a teardrop more than a kite, rounded at the top to protect the cavalier and tapering to a point below his boot. These shields likely originated in Byzantium in the later tenth century along with new cavalry tactics[71] and spread quickly to the Norman and Islamic

68 #132 in Glory of Byzantium. #193, Byzance. Marvin Ross, #120, Byzantine Antiquities, compares the face of Christ to the sapphire cameo in the Dumbarton Oaks collection. Closer inspection makes this link problematic in relation to datable Byzantine cameos' style in softer stones versus the harder material of the sapphires, none of which are datable by inscription or iconography. See the very similar steatite pendant in the Bode Museum, Berlin, which was dated by W. F. Volbach to the thirteenth century: #6835, Mittelalterliche Bildwerke aus Italien und Byzanz (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1930), 124.

69 #144 in Glory of Byzantium, 209-10. #59 in Byzantium, 330-1453, 395.

70 Maria G. Parani, Reconstructing the Reality of Images: Byzantine Material Culture and Religious Iconography (11th-15th centuries) 41: The Medieval Mediterranean, Peoples, Economies and Cultures, 400-1453 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 125-30.

71 David C. Nicolle, "Byzantine and Islamic Arms and Armour: Evidence for Mutual Influence," Graeco-Arabic IV (1991): 311. Ada Bruhn de Hoffmeyer, Military Equipment in the Byzantine Manuscript of Scylitzes in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid V: Gladius (Granada, 1966), 84-87.

lands.[72] The shape protected the rider's whole flank in a relatively lightweight, manageable form. By contrast, the triangular shield [Fig. 29] appears in Western Europe around the middle of the twelfth-century and spreads to Byzantium,[73] perhaps through the Crusades.[74] It is the classic shield usually pictured with Western Medieval knights, formed of a flat top and sides that curve or descend straight to a point.

The earliest Byzantine example of the kind of triangular shield found in the Louvre cameo [Cat. 83, Fig. 25] is the fresco of St. Christopher [Fig. 30] in the Church of the Hagioi Anargyroi, Kastoria, Greece (c. 1180).[75] The new shields contrast with a slightly earlier depiction of soldier saints balancing kite-shaped shields on the ground in the nearby Church of St. Nicholas Kasnitzes, Kastoria (1160's or 70's). Around 1191 the official seal of John, Metropolitan of Serres, still displays two kite-shaped shields between Ss. George and Demetrios blessed by Christ.[76] Christ in bust hovers over the two saints, who stand in profile with arms upraised toward Christ, while their shields lean against spears in the center of the composition. Then in the Palaiologan period, depictions of uneven ranks of

72 See the discussion of Islamic shields in David Nicolle, Early Medieval Islamic Arms and Armour Gladius: Tomo Especial (Madrid: Instituto de estudios sobre armas antiguas, 1976), 99 ff. They first appear in 1087 on the Bab al-Nasr in Cairo, Egypt.

73 David C. Nicolle, Arms and Armour of the Crusading Era 1050-1350 (White Plains, NY: Kraus International, 1988): #706 (capital of Ste. Foy, Conques at turn of twelfth century); #1299-1300 ("Roland" reliefs on front of Cathedral of S. Zeno, Verona, c. 1138); #752 (tomb of Geoffrey d'Anjou, 1150's); #729 (frescoes of Templar church, Cressac, Angoulême, perhaps after 1163).

74 Ibid., #803 appears to show Count Baldwin II of Edessa (1100-1118) balancing a kite-shaped shield on the ground. However, #802 and #804 show the same form pointing upwards as a sword. Anomalies in armor and dress suggest that this small triangle is not a shield but a sword. From about 1180 onwards, it appears widely in a Russian manuscript (#203h), carvings of a church in Kent (#890) and Germany.

75 Doula Mouriki, "The Wall Paintings of the Church of the Panagia at Moutoullas, Cyprus," Byzanz und der Westen: Studien zur Kunst des europ*äischen Mittelalters* ed. Irmgard Hutter (Vienna: Vlg. der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1984), 191 ff.

76 John Nesbitt and Nicolas Oikonomides eds. Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1991), I.42.4. Compare a similar composition from Corinth of Ss. Theodore the Recruit and General between noticeably ovoid shields, which is datable to the last quarter of the twelfth century in ibid., volume II.25.2.

standing soldier saints in mixed panoply become common. For example, a fresco on the northwest pier in the nave in the Church of the Holy Trinity in Sopoćani, Serbia, (ded. 1265) depicts a military saint balancing a life-sized triangular shield on the ground next to a representation of St. Demetrios balancing an oblong shield.[77] Following the Latin Occupation, the regular depiction of triangular shields confirms their plausibility as a common armament in the late Byzantine period.

Like the earlier Roman cameos that came into the possession of Cardinal Humbert and Abbot Suger, the Paris sardonyx cameo [Cat. 83, Fig. 25] employs the subtle alternation of more than two colored layers to great effect. The chestnut brown of the figures' face, hair, and armor contrasts with the white of the rest of the figures, and the scene stands on the dark gray-brown ground in a complex play of modeling. The white cloaks behind the figures, for example, lie behind the bulging white musculature of the legs and further pronounced sheen of the leather armor that marks the top layer of the stone. At the same time, the artisan has been able to wrap the arms of the warrior saints around their weapons, both in white, so that the dynamic gestures appear to stand out against the armor, which actually lies on a slightly higher layer of stone. It is this masterful modeling of space in the limited shades of the cameo that best evokes Byzantine relief work generally. Scholars understandably have dated the Paris sardonyx of Ss. George and Demetrios [Cat. 83, Fig. 25] to the decades just before the sack of Constantinople in 1204, in part because of the refined style of the cameo, which they associate with a notion of Constantinopolitan refinement. At the same time, its refinement seems incongruous with the typically less refined styles of the serpentine medallion of around 1078 [Cat. 37, Fig.

77 Fig. 255 in Vojislav J. Djurić, *Sopoćani* (Leipzig: Veb E. A. Seeman Vlg., 1967).

21] and a double-sided bloodstone cameo of Alexios V Doukas [Cat. 102, Figs. 22-23] around 1205. Its reliance on a system of economical, straight cuts seems to represent the culmination of a middle Byzantine style, while the cameo of Alexios Doukas looks ahead to the plasticity of late Byzantine examples.

A bloodstone cameo of St. George in the Cleveland Museum of Art [Cat. 77, Fig. 31] exhibits a similar tension between style and iconography, as it depicts the saint holding a small, triangular shield inscribed with a cross.[78] Dating has revolved around discussion of its style, which has been seen as a move away from Macedonian plasticity of the tenth century to an increasingly more schematized style.[79] In comparison with the stacked volumes and plasticity of the serpentine medallion of the Theotokos Blachernitissa [Cat. 37, Fig. 21] in London (dated by inscription to 1078-1081), the bloodstone of St. George is starkly planar and the cutting schematic. The gridlike coiffure, ovoid head and hatching of the neckline are much closer to a bloodstone cameo of St. George in Venice of around 1205 inscribed to Alexios V Doukas [Cat. 102, Fig. 23].[80] There the saint balances a Norman shield on the ground that is inscribed with a Crusader's cross, much like the Cleveland and Paris examples. Finally as has just been demonstrated above, the clearly triangular shield must date no earlier than the end of the twelfth century. Based on this comparison, the Cleveland example certainly is a Byzantine cameo of the thirteenth century that simply employs a more spare and linear style than the Paris sardonyx of the

78 #21 in Holger A. Klein ed., Sacred Gifts and Worldly Treasures (NY: Abrams, 2007), 79.

79 Klein cites the discussion of Wentzel, "Die byzantinischen Kameen in Kassel," 91-92. An unpublished jasper cameo of St. George in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York includes a Norman shield, although the saint wears a chlamys and holds the sword downward by the hilt. I am grateful to Helen Evans for providing access to the Met's cameos and generously sharing curatorial information.

80 Hans Wentzel, "Datierte und datierbare byzantinische Kameen," 10-11.

warrior saints [Cat. 83, Fig. 25]. The himation draped over the shoulder of the Cleveland saint compares to Byzantine depictions of the Apostles and, perhaps, is an antiquarian touch. Overall, the similarly graphic quality of hair and drapery in the Paris sardonyx [Cat. 83, Fig. 25] and Cleveland bloodstone [Cat. 77, Fig. 31] cameos suggests that various styles of gem cutting were popular in Byzantine circles around the turn of the thirteenth century.

The popularity of depicting the archangel Michael in glyptic displays this variety of styles and offers clues to larger artistic trends. One can find representations of Michael with his sword drawn already in the mid-eleventh century churches of Cappadocia, such as the Elmalı or Karanlık Kilise, but the first sculptural example is the enameled icon [Fig. 32] now in the treasury of San Marco, Venice.[81] Its style suggests a work of the twelfth century, and the archangel holds a globe cruciger in his left hand instead of the sheath typical of Byzantine representations. It may witness the popularity of St. Michael in Byzantine sculpture, but its peculiar iconography and colorful enameled ground seem aimed at maximizing the potential of the medium. By contrast, Putsko groups the double-sided cameo of Michael and Demetrios in the Walters Art Museum [Cat. 135, Fig. 33] with that of Alexios V Doukas in Venice [Cat. 102, Figs. 22-23].[82] They both display the same interest in rendering the lamellar armor and the strips of the leather skirt (pteryges).[83]

81 #19 "Icon with full-length figure of St Michael," The Treasury of San Marco Venice, Milan: Olivetti for the Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1984.

82 Putzko, "Die zweiseitige Kamee in der Walters," 175. Alice Bank, "Vier byzantinisierende Kameen aus der Ermitage," 11-12.

83 See the steatite examples of the thirteenth century #105, 107 in Kalavrezou-Maxeiner,Byzantine Icons in Steatite.

The archaizing armor, sharply tapered sword,[84] and use of sapphire all place a cameo of the archangel in the Troitse-Sergieva Lavra [Cat. 140, Fig. 34] after 1204 rather than in the middle Byzantine period.[85]

The more telling example is the bloodstone of St. Michael [Cat. 68, Fig. 35] in the Cabinet des Médailles of the Bibliothèque Nationale, which Michael Alcouffe placed in the Macedonian period following Alice Bank.[86] The globular eyes and nose suggest the same ambit as the bloodstone of St. John the Evangelist in Kassel [Cat. 93, Fig. 20], which likely dates after the Ottonian example in Munich [Cat. 95, Fig.17]. A small bloodstone cameo of the Theotokos Blachernitissa in Lyon [Cat. 39, Fig. 90] also may belong to this group.[87] The relatively crude facial features of all these cameos immediately suggests the same globular approach of the so-called glass paste cameos, which hardly date before the twelfth century and mainly from the thirteenth onward, for reasons that will be discussed in the next chapter. The Michael in the Cabinet des Médailles [Cat. 68, Fig. 35] sports a muscled cuirass and a moderate broadsword, somewhat similar to a the depiction of St. Theodore Teron in the katholicon of Hosios Loukas from the beginning of the eleventh century.[88] However, the sword and especially the sheath are longer like those found in twelfth-

84 Piotr Ł. Grotowski, Arms and Armour of the Warrior Saints: Tradition and Innovation in Byzantine Iconography (843-1261) trans. Richard Brzezinski (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 355.

85 L. M. Vorontsova, "Vizantiiskie kamei iz riznitsy Troitse-Sergievoi lavry [Byzantine Cameos from a risnitsa of the Trinity-Sergius Lavra]," in Vizantiisckaia ideia: Vizantiia v epokhu Komninov I Paleologov [The Byzantine Idea: Byzantium in the epoch of the Komnenoi and Paleologues] ed. Vera N. Zalesskaia (St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennyi Ermitazh, 2006, 14 н. 25, follows Russian authors in her middle Byzantine dating.

86 #189 "Camée: l'archange saint Michel," Byzance: l'art byzantin dans les collections publiques fran*çaises*, 280.

87 #198 "Camée: Vierge orante," Byzance: l'art byzantin dans les collections publiques fran*çaises*, 285.

88 Grotowski, Arms and Armour of the Warrior Saints, 130-131, provides comparisons for the muscled cuirass from the ninth through the twelfth centuries. The sword lengthens and tapers from the twelfth century onwards.

century depictions of warrior saints.[89] Despite the eleventh-century iconography, his hair is briefly cut into irregular polyhedrons and the plaits that stream down the side of his head are neatly hatched like the feathers of his wings, both in a style that seems to find its logical end in the Cleveland cameo with St. George [Cat.77, Fig.31] or that of Alexios V Doukas [Cat. 102, Figs. 22-23]. A thirteenth-century example from the Kremlin Museum presents nearly the same iconography and style of cutting of the wings in more common lamellar armor [Cat. 137, Fig. 36].[90] This small group of cameos does not find clear stylistic parallels in Western Medieval art of the period, other than the general appearance of glass cameos during the later Crusades.

Daniel in the Lions' Den

The last group of cameos to delineate middle Byzantine glyptic represents the Prophet Daniel in the lions' den. Because of the striking variety of these representations and unity of material, scholars have focused on their provenance among the numerous Medieval cameos that carve a dark figure in high relief out of a light ground.[91] By contrast, the few clearly Byzantine cameos in sardonyx depict light figures against a dark ground. The earliest and, perhaps, the only middle Byzantine example is found on a mottled red jasper in the Benaki Museum, Athens, that portrays Daniel standing within a circular den flanked by two lions [Cat. 85, Fig. 37]. By contrast, the British Museum's example [Cat. 87, Fig. 38] stands 2.55 cm high and 2.07 cm wide in a relatively low relief that utilizes

89 Parani, Reality of Images, 135.

90 Irina A. Sterligova, "Maloizvestnye proizvedeniia srednevisantiiskoi gliptiki v museiakh Mosckovskogo Kremlia [Little Known Words of Middle Byzantine Glyptic in Museums of the Moscow Kremlin]," Vizantiickaia ideia [The Byzantine Idea],185.

91 Alice Bank, "Sur le problème de la glyptique italo-byzantine," Rivista di studi byzantine e slavi (1983): 311-18. Rainer Kahsnitz, "Die Staufische Kameen," in Die Zeit der Staufer (Würtemmbergisches Landesmuseum, 1977), 477-520. Hans Wentzel, "Die byzantinischen Kameen in Kassel," 92 ff.

several layers to distinguish the light, bluish flesh tones and brown costume of the figure from the dark, opaque ground on which he stands. A similar sardonyx example in the Cathedral of the Assumption in Cividale [Cat. 86, Fig. 39] measures 2.05 cm high and 1.45 cm wide, although the figure is executed in brown and white against a golden brown background.[92] The cameo of Daniel in the Museo Nazionale, Naples, stretches 3.7 cm long and is the sole example cut in blue agate, a stone that became popular in Europe since colonial times when it was discovered in Brazil.[93] It also is unusual for including the bust of a hermit in a robe with cowl on the reverse, perhaps an indication that it was made in Italy rather than Byzantium. Another cameo in the Galleria Sabauda, Turin [Cat. 91, Fig. 40], measures 2.6 cm and shows a light figure against a dark brown ground. The specimen [Cat. 88, Fig. 41] in the Staatliche Münzsammlung, Munich, is 3.2 cm large and cut in multiple layers, with the figure sculpted in segments of bluish white and light brown against a dark brown ground. Two cameos of Daniel in the Lions' Den in the Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, follow the late Byzantine types of a dark-on-light sardonyx [Cat. 89, Fig. 55], measuring 4.4 cm x 3.4 cm (inv. ω.368), and a polychrome sardonyx [Cat. 90, Fig. 56], measuring 2.4 cm x 2.2 cm (inv. ω.360). Although a group of late Byzantine cameos feature the prophet without lions, often holding a scroll or book, most cameos of Daniel in the Lions' Den, with the exception of the Benaki cameo [Cat. 85, Fig. 37], fit uneasily within the corpus of middle Byzantine cameos for one reason or another.

The iconography of the lions and composition of the Daniel cameos

92 G. C. Menis, "Un malnoto cammeo cividalese con Daniele fra i leoni vestito alla persiana," Rivista di archeologia cristiana 49/2 (1973): 187.

93 # 1497 in Hans Wentzel, "Mittelalterliche Gemmen in den Sammlungen Italiens," Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorisches Intstitutes in Florenz 7/3-4 (Jul., 1957), 268.

actually goes back to Late Antiquity, where the composition of a frontal figure flanked by other figures was synonymous of powerful intercession. The scheme of Daniel certainly implies his taming of the lions through prayer, much like popular tokens of St. Menas [Fig. 42] in Late Antiquity.[94] Just after Iconoclasm though, Daniel re-appeared between the lions in a ninth-century codex of Cosmas Indicopleustes (Vat. gr. 699 fol. 75r)[95] and a deluxe illuminated copy of sermons by Gregory Nazianzen, the so-called Paris Gregory (Paris BN gr. 510), from the end of that century.[96] Also from the ninth century, the Byzantine tradition of marginal psalter illumination represents Daniel as the seer of a vision that foreshadowed Christ's birth from a Virgin, the stone not cut by human hands. Starting with the Menologion of Basil II (c. 1000), the prophet appears between the lions, now in a cave set within a landscape.[97] Although he appears with the Prophet Isaiah in a psalter of 1059 (Vat. gr. 752, fol. 134r), the prophet stands in a stylized dark circle [Fig. 43], as in the Benaki jasper.[98] The Theodore (1066) and Barberini Psalters (c. 1060's) retain the traditional scene of Daniel's dream found in earlier psalters, but they now include illuminations of Daniel flanked by lions too. As if to emphasize the sudden popularity of this scheme from the middle of the eleventh century, a double-sided bronze

94 Gary Vikan, "Art, Medicine, and Magic in Early Byzantium," 81-83. Christopher Walter, The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 185-86. Warren T. Woodfin, "An Officer and a Gentleman: Transformations in the Iconography of a Warrior Saint," DOP 60 (2006): 114-15.

95 Cosmas Indicopleustès, Topographie chrétienne vol. II ed. and trans. Wanda Wolska-Conus Sources chrétiennes 159 (Paris: CERF, 1970), V.173[1], 262-264.

96 Leslie Brubaker, Vision and Meaning in Ninth-Century Byzantium: Image as Exegesis in the Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus (Cambridge UP, 1999), 366-375.

97 Il Menologio di Basilio II (cod. Vaticano Greco 1613) 2: Tavole (Turin: Fratelli Bocca, 1907), 252. For bibliography see #55 in Glory of Byzantium.

98 Ernest T. De Wald, Illustrations in the Manuscripts of the Septuagint vol. III: Psalms and Odes pt. 2: Vaticanus Graecus 752 (Princeton UP, 1941), 19, pl. XXVII.

enkolpion now in the Museum of Fine Arts, Richmond, features Daniel between lions and epigraphy typical of eleventh-century Byzantine metalwork.[99] In all of these depictions except for Vat. gr. 752, Daniel wears a pill-box hat and a tunic girt up around his loins.

The spiritual and historical importance of the Old Testament prophet certainly rose with international pilgrimage to his relics in Constantinople during the Crusades.[100] The English history of William of Malmsebury mentioned the prophet's tomb in Constantinople in his Gesta regum Anglorum of 1120. The Russian archbishop of Novgorod, Anthony, mentioned a popular visit to his tomb in 1200, and two fourteenth-century Russian pilgrims noted the "church of St. Daniel" as the place they received pilgrim tokens attesting to their journey. Pilgrims were impressed by the prophet's red marble sarcophagus, which rested on two sculpted lions. Beyond the connections of lions to the narrative of Daniel's life, mechanical lions that roared also flanked the emperor's throne in Constantinople. Perhaps, these lions flank the emperor in reference to King Solomon's throne, which unexpectedly implicates the prophet in Byzantine politics.

Both the nighttime seer of future kingdoms and the rebel against Mesopotamian hegemony are baldly political figures in Byzantium. The early Byzantine Vision of Daniel, after all, was the biblical authorization of the Macedonian dynasty.[101] Likewise, the legends of resistance to the Baghdad caliphate that crystallized in Digenes Akritas around

---

99 #42 in Art of Late Rome and Byzantium ed. Anna Gonosová and Christine Kondoleon (Richmond, VA: Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, 1994), 120-121.

100 George Majeska, "A Medallion of the Prophet Daniel in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection," DOP 28 (1974): 363-364.

101 Paul J. Alexander, The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition ed. with intro. Dorothy deF. Abrahamse (Berkeley: U of California, 1985). Liudprand of Cremona "The Embassy of Liudprand," 39, in Complete Works of Liudprand of Cremona ed. with intro. Paolo Squatriti (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 2007), 262.

the turn of the twelfth century also underly the Komnenian emphasis on Daniel in the lions' den.[102] A lead seal of the judge Gregory Doxopatres from the early twelfth century depicts the prophet standing on a thin ground line between lions, his loins girt for spiritual battle and with barely a hat distinguishable on his curly head [Fig. 44].[103] A nearly identical lead seal of "Daniel imperial protospatharios and kommerkiarios of Chaldia" likely belongs to the eleventh century, when a duke ruled the ducate of Chaldia bordering Armenia and before the fateful defeat of Byzantine forces in the nearby mountain pass of Mantzikert in 1071.[104] The play on words of Byzantine Chaldia and ancient Chaldea doubtlessly would have delighted the Byzantine official. However, the depiction of Daniel is rare among Byzantine lead seals, which makes his enduring popularity in glyptic all the more remarkable.

The other polychrome Daniel cameos similar to it are one in the British Museum [Cat. 87, Fig. 38] and another in the Hermitage [Cat. 90, Fig. 56], which Russians scholars have rightly judged either Byzantine or Italian around the turn of the thirteenth century.[105] Since this polychrome technique becomes common in Gothic cameos, it is tempting to

---

102 Elizabeth Jeffreys ed. and trans. Digenis Akritis: The Grottaferrata and Escorial versions (Cambridge UP, 1998; 2004 pbk.), xxx-xli. Roderick Beaton, The Medieval Greek Romance 2nd ed. rev (Cambridge UP, 1996), 32-33. Roderick Beaton and David Ricks, Digenes Akrites: new approaches to Byzantine heroic Poetry (Aldershot: King's College London, 1993).

103 #73 in Valentina S. Šandrovskaja and Werner Seibt with Natascha Seibt, Byzantinische Bleisiegel der Staatlichen Eremitage mit Familiennamen 1: Sammlung Lichačev – Namen von A bis I (Vienna: Vlg. der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005), 90.

104 #442 in G. Zacos ed. John W. Nesbitt, Byzantine Lead Seals 2:1-1089 (Bern: Benteli, 1984), 242. The title of kommerkiarios is well attested as an imperial position for the eighth through eleventh centuries on the borders of the empire. See Nicholas Oikonomides, "The Role of the Byzantine State in the Economy," in Economic History of Byzantium: From the Seventh through the Fifteenth Century ed. Angeliki Laiou (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 2002), 984-88. Where scholars sometimes dated such seals later in the past, they "are in no case demonstrably later than the mid eleventh century," according to Archibald Dunn, "The Kommerkiarios, the Apotheke, the Dromos, the Vardarios, and The West," Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 17 (1993): 15.

place these few examples in a French or Italian ambit, in spite of their Greek titulature. By this point in history, an able craftsman could just as well have made them in the Crusader states or Paris as in Venice.[106] While one would expect to find Greek-speakers more easily in the Crusader states or Venice, finding Greek inscribed on a small group of items does not require a Greek-speaking industry or workshop.

A close comparison with the Benaki jasper cameo [Cat. 85, Fig. 37], though, is a double-sided steatite icon in Richmond [Fig. 57] that features the same straight hem of the tunic and bell-shaped mantle.[107] Because of Daniel's dynamic pose to the right, the simplified features, and double-sided format; scholars have placed this cameo in the thirteenth century. The pose and hem could derive from the scene of Daniel visited by Habakkuk and an angel in the lion's den [Fig. 58], found on bronze doors on Monte San Angelo, Italy.[108] An inscription on the doors attributes them to Constantinople in 1076, just a decade after Desiderius ordered Byzantine bronze doors for his monastery on Monte Cassino.[109] Another standing polychrome cameo of Daniel in the British Museum [Cat. 87, Fig. 38] displays a similar turn of the heard downward and to the right, if not the twisting pose of the Richmond steatite. The British Museum cameo also includes a strange,

105 Alice Bank, "Vier byzantinisierende Kameen aus der Hermitage," in Beiträge zur Kunst des Mittelalters: Festschrift für Hans Wentzel zum 60. Geburtstag (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Vlg., 1975), 15. Note that she has placed the wrong cameo as figure 5. Figure 4 is the one from the Hermitage that she analyzes.

106 Pace Paul Williamson, "Daniel between the lions: a new sardonyx cameo for the British Museum,"Jewellry Studies 1 (1983): 37-38.

107 #44 in Art of Late Rome and Byzantium, 124-125

108 Guglielmo Matthiae, Le porte bronzee bizantine in Italia (Rome:Officina Edizioni Roma, 1971), 83-89. Gioia Bertelli, "La porta di Monte Sant'Angelo tra storia e conservazione," in Le porte del Paradiso: Arte e tecnologia bizantina tra Italia e Mediterraneo ed. Antonio Iacobini (Rome: Campisano, 2009), 322-323.

109 Herbert Bloch, "Origin and Fate of the Bronze Doors of Abbot Desiderius of Monte Cassino," DOP 41 (1987), 89-91.

scalloped doublet on Daniel's chest, a cape that curls in at the edges unlike Byzantine depictions, and squat thighs that look only like the cameo in Cividale [Cat. 86, Fig. 39]. That example also features a cape that curls in at the edges, and the physiognomy is curiously Gothic. Finally, a seal in the Hermitage [Fig. 91] echoes the bell-shaped cape of the Benaki cameo [Cat. 85, Fig. 37],[110] which is only found elsewhere in the dark figure against white ground cameo in Turin [Cat. 91, Fig. 40] – almost certainly a Western work of the thirteenth century or later.

The Benaki jasper [Cat. 85, Fig. 37] appears to have been executed right around the time of the Fourth Crusade, where it matches late Komnenian depictions of Daniel in a way that gives it a claim to authenticity among Byzantine Daniel cameos. Like most Byzantine cameos it is a jasper, but unlike most others it is a red jasper that evokes descriptions of the prophet's sarcophagus as a site of pilgrimage by Western and Eastern Christians alike. The prophet also is depicted standing within a circle that represents the lions' den and was popular in iconography of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The bell-shaped cloak and fact that his tunic falls straight down over his legs instead of girt up reinforces the impression of this cameo dating from the turn of the thirteenth century, as well. The plastic curve of his features, particularly noticeable in the hands, the larger-than-life head, and double-sided format fit well with the cameo of Alexios V Doukas [Cat.102, Fig.22-23] around 1205. By contrast, the other cameos of Daniel standing between lions probably all date to the thirteenth century, when the Latin occupation of Constantinople brought Western and Eastern artisans into regular contact.

110 O. V. Osharina, "Obraz sv. Daniila vo rvu l'vinom v vizantiiskom iskusstve pozdnekomninskogo vremeni [Image of St. Daniel in the Lions' Den in Byzantine Art of the Late Komenian Time]," in Vizantiiskaia ideia [The Byzantine Idea], 101. She places the seal in the thirteenth century.

Conclusions

Dating Byzantine cameos has proved to be an intractable problem, which may help account for their invisibility in the grand narratives and great debates of art history. No technical tests can help to date or localize them, and their limited range of subjects requires extremely subtle observations to identify new traits within the conservative iconographies. From the ninth until the sixteenth century, six Byzantine cameos bear personal inscriptions, and two others are found on an object dated by historical event. These eight cameos out of one hundred and seventy one hardly form a representative sample either, since all but one are connected to imperial persons. They remain touchstones for the study of Byzantine cameos though, because they are stylistically representative of the genre. The genre encompasses several styles in no clear evolution and with no clear relationship to other forms of Byzantine sculpture in ivory, marble or steatite.

The intaglio of the Deesis inscribed to Anna (presumably the princess born 835) [Cat. 1, Fig. 11] displays a fine graphic style unlike Classical glyptic. Rather than the drilled volumes of Classical figures, the Byzantine jeweler of the mid-ninth century has employed shallow, angular wheel cuts joined together smoothly to draw the sinuous outlines of the holy figures. A sard of Christ Pantokrator [Cat. 6, Fig. 15] standing on a dais blessing was dedicated to the Despot Leo (r. 886-912). In contrast with the graphic style of the Deesis, this figure of Christ is excavated from the gem in low relief on a small arched cameo about the size of a human thumb. Its fine articulation of volumes and details recalls much larger marble icons of the middle Byzantine period, although the two works remain recognizably different stylistically. Where the cameo of John the Evangelist

on the Gospels of Otto III [Cat. 95, Fig. 17] and St. Paul on the Cross Reliquary of Henry II [Cat. 104, Fig.18] are clearly linear reliefs, the large serpentine medallion carved for Emperor Nikephoros III Botaneiates (r. 1078-1081) [Cat. 37, Fig.21] continues to display stacked, rounded volumes like one finds on a birthday cake.

What is curious about these two currents in middle Byzantine glyptic is that the more graphic style seems to have been a general working principle in several Byzantine crafts. Although the Veroli Casket and Harbaville Triptych offer rounded bodies, many more Byzantine ivories represent frontal figures excavated in relatively low relief with details inscribed into the surface. The fragile nature of steatite as a substance likely account for its reliance on low relief, even in the narrative scenes where ivories tended toward figures almost in the round. While some marble icons display a fine, plastic style, most figures simply were excavated and detailed without the finely modulated transitions between various depths that one associates with Roman relief. Byzantine artisans seem to have been satisfied with the same generally graphic style for icons in a range of sculptural materials, whether ground with a lapidary wheel, carved with knives or chiseled from stone – not to mention chasing and metal relief.

The projecting volumes of the Ss. Demetrios and George sardonyx (end 12th c) [Cat. 83, Fig. 25] and the geometric figures of the cameo for Alexios V Doukas (c. 1205) [Cat. 102, Figs. 22-23] mark a change, though. The emphasis here is on crafting believable volumes rather than simply reproducing significant details of clothing or hair. Of course, the titulature and basic attributes of figures still bear the weight of meaning in recognizing the saints to which the owners prayed. Now, though, the higher relief of figures gives the saints a sculptural presence that often was missing from middle Byzantine cameos. The

triumph of sculpture, or rather the separation of sculptural and pictorial icons, belongs to the history of late Byzantine cameos.

2 Cameos of the Late Byzantine Period (13th-15th c)

Christ

108. Cameo of Christ Emmanuel [Fig. 64]
13th-14th
Sardonyx (dark on light)
2.32x1.94x.65
Kassel, Museumslandschaft Hessen
Wenztel, "Die byzantinischen Kameen in Kassel," fig. 79

109. Cameo of Christ Emmanuel
14th
Steatite, yellow
2.9x2.22
New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art
Byzantium: Faith & Power #146

110. Cameo of Christ Emmanuel [Fig. 63]
13th-14th
Sapphire
Sergiev Posad, Troitse-Sergieva Lavra
Vorontsova, "Vizantiiskie kamei iz riznitsy Troitse-Sergievoi lavry," Plate II

111. Cameo of Christ King of Glory (Man of Sorrows) [Fig.61]
13th
Sapphirine
Sergiev Posad, Troitse-Sergieva Lavra
Vorontsova, "Vizantiiskie kamei iz riznitsy Troitse-Sergievoi lavry," Plate VI

112. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
13th-16th
Rock crystal
6.1x6
Athens, Benaki Museum
Hoi Pyles tou Mysteriou: Thesauroi tes Orthodoxias apo ten Ellada #79

113. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
13th (early)
Bloodstone
4.35x3.03x1.17
Kassel, Museumslandschaft Hessen
Wenztel, "Die byzantinischen Kameen in Kassel," fig. 80

114. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
13th-14th
Sardonyx (dark on light)
2.18x1.81x.88
Kassel, Museumslandschaft Hessen
Wenztel, "Die byzantinischen Kameen in Kassel," fig. 81

115. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
13th
Sapphire
Moscow, Kremlin Armory
Sterligova, "Maloizvestnye proizvedeniia srednevisantiiskoi gliptiki v museiakh Moskovskogo Kremlia," Plate XXX.a

116. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
13th (early)
Bloodstone
4.3x4
Mt. Athos, Chilandar Monastery
Treasures of Mount Athos 9.11

117. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
13th
Sardonyx
3.63x2.49x.95
Oxford, Ashmolean Museum
Henig, The Content Family Collection of Ancient Cameos #193, Pl. XLVI

118. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator [Fig. 69]
13th
Bloodstone
4.5x4.1x1.05
Paris, Cabinet des Médailles
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #191

119. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
13th
Bloodstone
3.2x2.2
Paris, Louvre
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #331

120. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
14th-15th
Jadeite
Sergiev Posad, Troitse-Sergieva Lavra
Vorontsova, "Vizantiiskie kamei iz riznitsy Troitse-Sergievoi lavry," Plate IV

121. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator [Fig. 65]
13th-15th
Sapphire
3.27x2.37x1.49
Washington, DC, Dumbarton Oaks Collection
Sacred Art, Secular Context #3

122. Cameo of the Crucifixion [Fig. 68]
13th-14th
Sapphire
Moscow, Kremlin Armory
Sterligova, "Maloizvestnye proizvedeniia srednevisantiiskoi gliptiki v museiakh Moskovskogo Kremlia," Plate XXIX

Theotokos

123. Cameo of Theotokos Blachernitissa
13th-14th
Saphire
1.81x1.66x.78
Kassel, Museumslandschaft Hessen
Wenztel, "Die byzantinischen Kameen in Kassel," fig. 82

124. Cameo of Theotokos Blachernitissa
13th
Bloodstone
4x3
Mt. Athos, Chilandar Monastery
Treasures of Mount Athos 9,12

125. Cameo of Theotokos Blachernitissa
Reverse: cross
13th
Sardonyx
3.1x2.3
Munich, Bavaria Archaeological Museum
Byzanz: Das Licht aus dem Osten IV.80

126. Cameo of Theotokos Eleousa
14th
Slate
5.1x4.6
Sergiev Posad, Museum of History and Art
Museum of History and Art, Zagorsk #60

127. Cameo of Theotokos Hagiosoritissa [Fig. 66]
13th-14th
Sapphirine
Sergiev Posad, Troitse-Sergieva Monastery
Vorontsova, "Vizantiiskie kamei iz riznitsy Troitse-Sergievoi lavry," Plate VI

128. Cameo of Theotokos Hodegetria
Reverse: Panteleimon
13th (early)
Bloodstone
4.6x3.3
Athens, Kanellopoulos Museum
Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Art #235

129. Cameo of Theotokos Hodegetria
13th-14th
Bloodstone
3.8 tall
Athens, Kanellopoulos Museum
Everyday Life in Byzantium #709

130. Cameo of Theotokos Hodegetria
Reverse: George & Demetrios
14th–15th
Stone, dark
5.6x5.0
Helsinki, National Museum of Finland
Byzantium: Late Antique & Byzantine Art in Scandinavian Collections #103

131. Cameo of Theotokos Hodegetria [Fig. 92]
13th-14th
Agate
Sergiev Posad, Troitse-Sergieva Lavra
Vorontsova, "Vizantiiskie kamei iz riznitsy Troitse-Sergievoi lavry," Plate VI

132. Cameo of Theotokos Platytera
13th-16th
Sapphire
Baltimore, Walters Art Museum
Ross & Laourdas, "The Pendant Jewel of the Metropolitan Arsenius"

133. Cameo of Theotokos Platytera
14th-15th
Sapphirine
Moscow, Kremlin Armory
Sterligova, "Maloizvestnye proizvedeniia srednevisantiiskoi gliptiki v museiakh Moskovskogo Kremlia," Plate XXXI

134. Cameo of Virgin & Child Enthroned [Fig. 67]
13th-15th
Sapphire
Moscow, Kremlin Armory
Sterligova, "Maloizvestnye proizvedeniia srednevisantiiskoi gliptiki v museiakh Moskovskogo Kremlia," Plate XXVIII

Archangel Michael

135. Cameo of Michael Holding Sword [Fig.33]
Reverse: Demetrios
13th(early)
Bloodstone
5x3.1
Baltimore, Walters Art Museum
Putzko, "Die zweiseitige Kamee in der Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore," fig. 1a

136. Cameo of Michael Holding Sword
13th (early)
Sardonyx (dark on light)
3.71x2.77x.85
Kassel, Museumslandschaft Hessen
Wenztel, "Die byzantinischen Kameen in Kassel," fig. 83

137. Cameo of Michael Holding Sword [Fig. 36]
13th
Bloodstone
Moscow, Kremlin Armory
Sterligova, "Maloizvestnye proizvedeniia srednevisantiiskoi gliptiki v museiakh Moskovskogo Kremlia," Plate XXXII

138. Cameo of Michael Holding Sword
13th
Sardonyx
2.7x2.3
Munich, Staatliche Münzsammlung
Rom und Byzanz: Schatzkammerstücke aus bayerischen Sammlungen #78

139. Cameo of Michael Holding Sword
13th
Agate, banded
2.5x2.4
Paris, Louvre
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #204

140. Cameo of Michael Holding Sword [Fig. 34]
3th–14th
Sapphire
Sergiev-Posad, Troitse-Sergieva Lavra
Vorontsova, "Vizantiiskie kamei iz riznitsy Troitse-Sergievoi lavry," Plate III

Bishops

141. Cameo of Nicholas, Cosmas & Damian
14th
Shale
9.7x5.5
Novgorod
Sergiev Posad, Museum of History and Art
Museum of History and Art, Zagorsk #64

Soldiers

142. Cameo of Boris & Gleb Holding Spear
Mounted
14th
Slate
8.2x5.3
Sergiev Posad, Museum of History and Art
Museum of History and Art, Zagorsk #64

143. Cameo of Demetrios Holding Sword
13th-14th
Sapphire

1.72x1.36x.69
Kassel, Museumslandschaft Hessen
Wenztel, "Die byzantinischen Kameen in Kassel," fig. 87

144. Cameo of George Holding Spear Under Canopy
13th
Bloodstone
4x3
Athens, Kanellopoulos Museum
Everyday Life in Byzantium #714

145. Cameo of George Mounted Slaying Dragon
13th-14th
Slate
4.6x4.9
Helsinki, National Museum of Finland
Late Antique & Byzantine Art in Scandinavian Collections

146. Cameo of George Mounted Holding Spear
14th
Slate
9.0x5.0
Sergiev Posad, Museum of History and Art
Museum of History and Art, Zagorsk #64

147. Cameo of George Holding Spear
13th-15th
Jadeite
Sergiev Posad, Troitse-Sergieva Lavra
Vorontsova, "Vizantiiskie kamei iz riznitsy Troitse-Sergievoi lavry," Plate I

148. Cameo of Theodore the Commander Holding Spear
13th-14th
Sardonyx
4.1x3.0
Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery
Early Christian & Byzantine Art #558

149. Cameo of Theodore Holding Spear
13th-14th
Bloodstone
3 cm.
Kassel, Museumslandschaft Hessen

Wenztel, "Die byzantinischen Kameen in Kassel," fig. 86

150. Cameo of Theodore Holding Sword
13th
Sardonyx (dark-on-light)
2.75x2.75x.95
Paris, Cabinet des médailles
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #329

Daniel

151. Cameo of the Prophet Daniel Holding a Scroll [Fig. 53]
13th (early)
Sardonyx (dark on light)
2.33x1.67x1.09
Kassel, Museumslandschaft Hessen
Wenztel, "Die byzantinischen Kameen in Kassel," fig. 88

152. Cameo of Daniel Holding a Scroll [Fig. 54]
13th
Bloodstone
3.1x2.5x0.85
Paris, Cabinet des médailles
Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises #330

153. Cameo of Daniel Holding a Scroll [Fig. 60]
Reverse: Hypatios
13th-14th
Bloodstone
Sergiev Posad, Troitse-Sergieva Lavra
Vorontsova, "Vizantiiskie kamei iz riznitsy Troitse-Sergievoi lavry," Plate II

154. Cameo of Daniel Pointing Upwards [Fig. 59]
13th-14th
Chalcedony, yellow
Sergiev Posad, Troitse-Sergieva Monastery
Vorontsova, "Vizantiiskie kamei iz riznitsy Troitse-Sergievoi lavry," Plate VI

John the Evangelist

155. Cameo of John the Evangelist
13th
Steatite
Turin, Galleria Sabauda (inv. 132)

Moretti, Roma bizantina p. 79-80

John the Forerunner

156. Cameo of John the Forerunner Holding Cross
13th (early)
Sardonyx (dark on light)
2.26x1.5x.65
Kassel, Museumslandschaft Hessen
Wenztel, "Die byzantinischen Kameen in Kassel," fig. 84

157. Cameo of John the Forerunner Holding Cross
14th
Sardonyx
Vatican, Museo Sacro
Rhighetti, "Le opere di glittica dei Musei Annessi alla Biblioteca Vaticana," tav. V fig. 4

Other

158. Cameo of Rider Jousting [Fig. 74]
13th-14th
Jadeite
4.75x3.37
Munich, Staatliche Münzsammlung
Rom und Byzanz: Schatzkammerstücke aus bayerischen Sammlungen #79

159. Cameo of Unidentified Saint
13th-14th
Jasper
Philadelphia, University Museum
Cameo and Intaglio: Engraved Gems from the Sommerville Collection #322

160. Cameo of Guria and Habib
14th-15th
Jadeite
Sergiev Posad, Troitse-Sergieva Lavra
Vorontsova, "Vizantiiskie kamei iz riznitsy Troitse-Sergievoi lavry," Plate V

Amulets

161. Intaglio of Medusa
Inscription: ΑΓΙΟC ΑΓΙΟC ΑΓΙΟC ΚΟΑCΦΑΩΟ ΩCΑΝΑCΤΦC ΥΧΙCΤΟΙC ΕΥΛΟΓΙΜΕΝΟC
Reverse: Anne and the Theotokos
Reverse inscription: ΥCΤΕΡΑ ΜΕΛΑΙΝΗ ΜΕΛΑΙΝΟΜΕΝΗ ΩC ΘΑΛΑΤ ΤΑΝ

ΓΑΛΗΝΗCΑΙΝΕΙ
13th
Plasma
Location unknown
J. Spier, "Byzantine Magical Amulets," #56

162. Cameo of Medusa
Inscription: ΥCΤΕΡΑ ΜΕΛΑΝΙ ΜΕΛΝΟΜΕΝΙ ΟC ΟΦ ΙΛΙΕ Κ ΟC ΔΡΑΚΟΙ CΥΡΙΖ Κ ΟCΛΕΟ . . .
Agate
Gotha, ducal collection
J. Spier, "Byzantine Magical Amulets," #53

163. Cameo of Medusa
Inscription: ΘΕΟΤΟΚΕ ΒΟΗΘΕΙ ΤΗ CΕ ΔΟΥΛΗ ΜΑΡΗΑΑΜ
Reverse: ΥCΤΕΡ ΜΕΛΑΝΙ ΜΕΛΑΝΟΜΕΛΙ Η ΜΕΛΑΝ.ΟC ΟΦΗC ΗΛΗΕC ΚΕ ΟΣ ΔΑΡΚΟΝ CΥΡΧΗΖΗC ΚΕ ΟC ΛΕΟ ΒΥΡΧΑCΕ Κ ΟC ΑΡΝΗΟΝ ΚΥΜΗΘΗΤ
Agate
Gotha, ducal collection
J. Spier, "Byzantine Magical Amulets," #54

164. Intaglio of Medusa
Inscription:
Reverse: Seven Sleepers of Ephesus
Reverse inscription:
13th
Bloodstone
5.9 diameter
Moscow, State Historical Museum
J. Spier, "Byzantine Magical Amulets," #59

165. Intaglio of Medusa
Inscription: ΚΕ ΒΟΘΗ ΤΟΝ ΦΟΡΟΝΤΑ
Reverse: Virgin Blachernitissa
Reverse inscription: ΗCΤΕΡΑ ΜΕΛΑΝΗ ΜΕΛΑΝΟΜΕΝΙ ΟC ΦΟΗC ΚΗΛΗΕCΕ ΟC ΘΑΛΑCΑ ΓΑΛΗΝΗCΟΝ ΟC ΠΡΟΒΑΤΟΝ ΠΡΑΗΝ ΚΕ ΟC ΚΑΤΝΟC
Bloodstone
5.2x4.7
Przemysl, Muzeum Narodowe Ziemi Przemyskiej
J. Spier, "Byzantine Magical Amulets," #57

166. Cameo of Medusa
Reverse inscription: ΥCΤΕΡΑ .ΕΛΑΝΗ ΜΙ.ΛΑΝΟΜΕΝΙ Ο. ΟΦΗC ΗΛΗΕCΕ Κ ΟC

AEON BPYXACE KE OC APNION KYMOY
Onyx
Location unknown
J. Spier, "Byzantine Magical Amulets," #52

Western Imitations & Intaglios

167. Intaglio of Emperors in bust Holding Patriarchal Cross [Fig. 72]
Renaissance
Agate, pink
4.2x4.8
Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery
Early Christian & Byzantine Art #571

168. Cameo of Christ Pantokrator
Reverse: intaglio of patriarchal cross
Modern
Bloodstone
4.6x3.9
Geneva, George Ortiz Collection
Glory of Byzantium #127

169. Cameo of Michael Holding Sword
Western European
13th-14th
Onyx
2.8x2.1x.4
New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art
Byzantium: Faith & Power #147

170. Cameo of Theodore [Fig. 75]
14th
Bloodstone
3.7x2.2
Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Kunstkammer
Byzanz: Pracht und Alltag #167

171. Intaglio Seal of Theodore Slaying the Hydra [Fig. 71]
Post-Byzantine
Onyx
3.4x2.6
New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art
Byzantium: Faith & Power #148

172. Cameo of the Trinity
13th-14th
Jasper
Philadelphia, University Museum
Cameo and Intaglio: Engraved Gems from the Sommerville Collection #323

Materials and Subjects of Cameos of the Late Byzantine Period

Late Byzantine cameos appear in a diversity of stones and styles compared with the homogeneity of middle Byzantine cameos. This diversity is most visible in the cameos attached to liturgical items and an icon frame of the founder of the St. Sergius Lavra outside of Moscow. Although the icon revetment was made in 1585, at least some of the gems presumably came to the monastery between its in founding in 1345 and the fall of Constantinople in 1453, perhaps as part of the legendary gift of the Patriarch of Constantinople, Philotheos Kokkinos (1353-54 and 1364-76). The monastery's collection includes a bloodstone cameo with the later iconography of Daniel in bust holding a scroll [Cat. 153, Fig. 60] and a sapphirine cameo with Christ as King of Glory (the Western type called Man of Sorrows) [Cat. 111, Fig. 61]. Since the King of Glory iconography dates from the end of the twelfth century in Byzantium and slightly later in the West,[111] there is no compelling reason to consider the sapphirine alone a middle Byzantine cameo among the late Byzantine cameos from the monastery. In fact, the crossed hands of Christ likely date it to the fourteenth century. These cameos include a range of opaque and transparent stones, middle and late Byzantine iconographies, and varying styles that appear late Byzantine.

The two most prevalent trends in late Byzantine cameos are the rise of onyx and sardonyx stones, as well as a number of transparent stones. As the previous discussion of middle Byzantine cameos makes clear, there are few termini for separating the sardonyx

111 Hans Belting, "An Image and its Function in the Liturgy: The Man of Sorrows in Byzantium," DOP 34 (1980-1981): 4-7. More fully see idem., The Image and Its Public in the Middle Ages: Form and Function of Early Paintings of the Passion trans. Mark Bartusis and Raymond Meyer (New Rochelle, NY: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1990).

cameos across the boundary of the Fourth Crusade (1204). This chapter looks at the Daniel cameos more closely to clarify their position in the evolution of Byzantine cameos in relationship to so-called Hohenstaufen cameos. Whatever their exact date, the appearance of onyx, sardonyx and banded agate cameos does not fit at all with the mass of bloodstones for which we have clear termini in the middle Byzantine period.

Transparent gems likewise show up most conspicuously in the collection of the Troitse-Sergieva Lavra and in Kassel, Germany, with stylistic features that are not continuous with the middle Byzantine period. They also do not correspond stylistically to Hohenstaufen cameos attributed to southern Italy, so their provenance remains enigmatic. Sapphires are the most common of these transparent gems, along with several amethysts. Several translucent jadeites [Cat. 120, 147, 158, 160] also are included in the catalog of Byzantine cameos for completeness, even if their style and material do not clearly correspond to late Byzantine cameos. A single onyx seal of St. Theodore battling the Hydra [Cat. 171, Fig. 71] also is included for completeness, although it is the only seal in the catalog and could just as well be a post-Byzantine work. That possibility still is part of the great diversification of possibilities in Byzantine glyptic after Latin rule.

Whether this cultural expansion mirrored new trading partners with new materials or whether Byzantine craftsmen created works for new masters is unclear, but cameos with both new and old Byzantine iconography appear suddenly in new materials. Some of the styles seem logically to grow out of middle Byzantine cameos, while new stylistic trends emerge from unknown sources. In addition, a related but enigmatic group of mostly red glass cameos with Greek or Latin titulature confuses the matter of assigning Byzantine cameos in this dynamic period. The single seal, one jadeite [Cat. 158, Fig. 74] and glass

cameos all include narrative scenes, which are unknown in early Byzantine glyptic. Only the late Byzantine cameos of the Crucifixion demonstrate this narrative interest, although even they fit within a long Byzantine tradition of pectoral cross reliquaries. Narrative iconography therefore is another argument, albeit circular, for separating Byzantine cameos from others and late from middle Byzantine cameos.

Western Cameos

When Crusaders sacked Constantinople in 1204, not even the Byzantines could pretend anymore that they were the direct offspring of Constantine and Justinian. Emperors and kings around the Mediterranean jockeyed to show themselves the heir of Augustan Rome. It consequently comes as no surprise to find a boom in sardonyx cameos around this time, as it had been associated with Roman imperial cameos. What is surprising is how difficult Byzantine and Western cameos have been to distinguish, perhaps owing as much to their scholarly obscurity as to their almost total lack of provenance. While they appear as rare and imperially-charged treasures of Byzantium, they seem to acquire a wider range of meanings in their Western Medieval appropriation.

The two societies took very different approaches to the re-use of Roman cameos, which was a continuous practice in the Western Middle Ages and quite rare in Byzantium.[112] Only three Roman cameos survive from purported Byzantine contexts: Cardinal Humbert supposedly acquired the sardonyx "Apotheosis of Germanicus" in Constantinople and donated to the Abbey of St. Evre of Toul, Lorraine in 1057; an agate

112 Erika Zwierlein-Diehl, Antike Gemmen und ihr Nachleben (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007). Gemma Sena-Chiesa ed., Gemme dalla corte imperiale alla corte celeste (Milan: Università degli studi di Milano, 2002). Antje Krug, "Antike Gemmen und das Zeitalter Bernwards," Bernward von Hildesheim und das Zeitalter der Ottonen: Katalog der Ausstellung eds. Michael Brandt und Arne Eggebrecht (Diözesanmuseum Hildesheim, 1993): 161-172.

cameo of Augustus inscribed to the 40 martyrs of Sebaste in the Byzantine period was acquired by Abbot Suger of St. Denis shortly before 1144; and the large sardonyx "Camée de France" [Fig. 45] was at the Pairis Abbey, in the Alsace, around 1206 as the center of a Greek Gospelbook cover.[113] Along with a sardonyx cameo of Honorius and Maria (398-407) that later was inscribed to Ss. Sergius and Bacchus, these cameos suggest the limited role of Roman imperial cameos in Byzantine art. They all were banded agate or sardonyx cameos (brown, light, dark) that featured Roman imperial figures and were re-ascribed in the Byzantine period to early Christian saints, presumably because of their Roman imperial style. Sergius and Bacchus, after all, were members of the imperial household, and the forty martyrs of Sebaste were Roman soldiers who had refused to pay homage to the last of the Tetrarchs, sometime between 316-324. They mostly seem to have been re-interpreted as Antique works, either associated with Christian saints or amenable to such association. This historiographical ambiguity also might help to explain the ease with which their Western counterparts assimilated Roman cameos that modern scholarship divides clearly between Roman imperial and late Antique in style.

The almost total lack of pre-Christian gems on Byzantine metalwork stands in contrast with Western Medieval reliquaries and crosses, which often incorporated Antique intaglios and cameos. Since most stones of Hellenic religious and magical motifs were cut for signet rings under the Roman Principate,[114] their absence on Byzantine works suggests that Byzantine patrons and jewelers understood them to be pagan works and refused to incorporate them into Christian works. The frequent re-use of such gems does not require

113 Cyril and Marlia Mundell Mango, "Cameos in Context." The abbot had preached and participated in the Fourth Crusade, which is presumably the source of the gem.

114 Jeffrey Spier, chapter 1 in Late Antique and Early Christian Gems.

that Western Christians moralized the Greco-Roman motifs, though.[115] Appropriation of Roman gems merely suggests that Western Christians found the allure of Antique gems greater than any dangers posed by the non-Christian iconography. The differences in Western and Byzantine image theory may account for fundamentally different attitudes toward materials and appropriation of past works, but that comparison lies beyond the scope of this study. What seems clear from artistic works, such as the many bone boxes of dancing or fighting putti, is that the Byzantine appropriation of pre-Christian art lay across a distinct divide in the discourse of art into sacred and profane.

The sudden appearance of cameos in Western Medieval records of the thirteenth century raises the problem of whether Byzantine sardonyx cameos reflect a continuity of Roman gem cutting or whether they belong to a European revival of Roman "state cameos" more generally. Little evidence suggests Byzantine production of sardonyx cameos in the aftermath of the crusaders' conquest of the Byzantine capital. Scholarly discussion of sardonyx cameos in the High Middle Ages consequently focuses on the likelihood of a cameo revival at the court of Frederick II of Hohenstaufen (Holy Roman Emperor from 1220-1250). The narrative of Byzantine works penetrating an Italian court and spreading northward leaves the impression that the political instability of the Fourth Crusade brought Western artisans into contact of Byzantine glyptics that initiated a byzantinizing phase in Western glyptic, a hypothesis which is only partially true.

Already between 1057 and 1206, several of the finest Roman cameos that survive already had come to modern-day France from Constantinople. They and other earlier

115 Erika Zwierlein-Diehl, "'Interpretatio christiana' : Gems on the Shrine of the Three Kings in Cologne," in Engraved Gems: Survivals and Revivals ed. Clifford Malcolm Brown (Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1997), 69-70.

examples or Roman glyptic, such as the cameo of Augustus on the Cross of Lothair [Fig. 46], would have been much more interesting examples of "Staatskameen" to imitate.[116] Even before the thirteenth century, northern European prelates and secular rulers also began to regularly commission portrait seals in metal and intaglio.[117] The first Medieval collection of cameos to receive more than a passing mention was the pawn agreement of Frederick II's collection following his death in 1250.[118] Although the catalog of various types of rings, stones, and so on attests to the patron's wealth and antiquarian tastes, it is not detailed enough for historians to identify potential surviving examples.

Perhaps due to the relatively plentiful documentation of Frederick II's reign, scholarship has focused on his court as the center of this glyptic revival.[119] Several of the most prominent cameos ascribed to his circle are sardonyx cameos that feature light figures against a dark ground. The key works used to assign cameos to the Hohenstaufen court of southern Italy are the examples in the Staatliche Münzsammlung [Fig. 47] and the Louvre [Fig. 48] of angels crowning a young, beardless man enthroned, probably the augustalis of Frederick II.[120] The Munich cameo [Fig. 47] especially returns to a more natural modeling of bodily volumes than the version in Paris [Fig. 48]. However, this modeling is natural in

116 Theo Jülich, "Gemmenkreuze: Die Farbigkeit ihres Edelsteinbesatzes bis zum 12. Jahrhundert," Aachener Kunstblätter 54-55 (1986-87): 159-168. Norbert Wibiral, "Augustus patrem figurat: Zu den Betrachtungsweisen des Zentralsteines am Lotharkreuz im Domschatz zu Aachen," Aachener Kunstblätter 60 (1994): 105-30.

117 Hans Wentzel, "Portraits 'á l'antique' on French Mediaeval Gems and Seals," trans. Charles Mitchell, Journal of the Warburg & Courtauld Institutes 16/3-4 (1953): 342-50. Idem., "Die vier Kameen im aachener Domschatz und die französische Gemmenschneidekunst des 13. Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift für Kunstwissenschaft* 8/1-2 (1954): 1-18.

118 Eugene H. Byrne, "Some Mediaeval Gems and Relative Values," Speculum 10/2 (Apr., 1935): 178 ff.

119 Rainer Kahsnitz, "Staufische Kameen" in Die Zeit der Staufer 5: Supplement (Stuttgart: Württembergisches Landesmuseum, 1979), 477-520.

120 Hans Wentzel, "'Staatskameen' im Mittelalter," Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen 4 (1962): 63-65.

the way that Gothic sculpture is realistic generally but does not necessarily follow the style of ancient Roman models, as for example, Niccolo Pisano tried to do and perhaps the drilled locks of the Louvre cameo [Fig. 48]. The rope-like strands of hair of the Munich augustalis [Fig. 47] and the rocks that rise up in bulbous waves to form the ground line find their best comparisons in the art of the mostly-French Crusader lands, particularly ivories.[121] Furthermore, the multiple layers of white, blue and brown against an indigo ground find an interesting parallel in the late Medieval cameo of a French monarch with scepters and crown, now in the Hermitage Museum [Fig. 49.]. That cameo certainly demonstrates an interest in French regal awareness as strong as Frederick's, although any claim to continuity with old Rome is less obvious than the dark on white sardonyx eagle cameos associated with Frederick or the so-called augustalis in the Louvre [Fig. 48]. Capetian France consequently provides another likely provenance for the revival of gem cutting along with Hohenstaufen Italy. A Parisian law of 1260 regulates the guild of crystal workers and lapidaries, among others.[122] This notice is more significant than a simple historical mention, because it attests to a whole lapidary industry developed enough to deserve regulation in an important European capital of the High Middle Ages.

Beyond the workshops of southern Italy, the Holy Roman Empire that Frederick II ruled also ranged across greater Germany and northern Italy. His residence in Italy and large collection of cameos hardly necessitates their manufacture in Italy. For example, Hans Wentzel attributed a fine sardonyx cameo of a young couple [Fig. 50] to the upper

121 Henry Maguire, "Ivories as Pilgrimage Art: A New Frame for the 'Frame Group," DOP 61 (2009): 117-146.

122 Geoffrey Grassin, "Le travail des gemmes au XIII^{e} siècle dans la Doctrina poliendi pretiosos lapides," Cahiers de civilisation médiévale 42 (1999): 133-34. The law appears in René de Lespinasse et François Bonnardot, Les métiers et corporations de la ville de Paris: XIIIe siècle, le livre des métiers d'Étienne Boileau (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1879), XXX, 61-63.

Rhine region around the end of the thirteenth century based on iconography, although he saw its style as reflecting a broader French influence.[123] Others have located its production in mid-thirteenth century Italy based on archaizing Roman features[124] and a close comparison with the idealized donor figures of the Ravello pulpit (1272).[125] However, the very shallow cutting, fine shading in the faces, and fine facial features do not compare with other Medieval cameos of any particular center. This difficult question of styles in the period demonstrates how international Gothic art had become, and it should caution us from constricting glyptic to a few famous centers of cultural diffusion, like Italy and France.

For example, Albert the Great described a full-blown mining industry in Saxony and Silesia in the pioneering Book of Minerals of the 1260's.[126] Although he relies heavily on Isidore of Seville and Marbode of Rennes for an explanation of stones' properties, the Dominican bishop defended their healing powers as completely natural phenomena. He actually attributes these properties to a vague notion of physico-chemical structure, which

123 Hans Wentzel, "Mittelalterliche Gemmen am Oberrhein und verwandte Arbeiten," in Form und Inhalt: Kunstgeschichtliche Studien, Otto Schmitt zum 60. Geburtstag am 13. Dezember 1950 dargebracht von seinen Freunden (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1950): 146-47.

124 Elisabeth Nau,"Meisterwerke staufischer Glyptik," Schwizerische numismatische Rundschau 45 (1966) 145-47, offers Roman comparisons with the young woman's hair, although the style is very different. Rainer Kasnitz summarizes the issues in #895 in Die Ziet der Staufer: Geschichte, Kunst, Kultur ed. Reiner Haussherr (Stuttgart: Württembergisches Landesmuseum, 1977): 698.

125 Nino Zchomelidse, "Amore virginis und honore patriae – Die Rufolo Kanzel im Dom von Ravello," Analecta Romana Instituti Danici 26 (1999): 100-102, and idem., "Allegory and Remembrance: Lay Patronage in the Angevin Kingdom," in Art, Ritual , and Civic Identity in Medieval Southern Italy (State College: Pennsylvania State UP, 2014): 154-55. I am grateful to the author for sharing an offprint and galley respectively. The compositional comparison is very close, except for the prominent knot on the back of the young woman's hairstyle in the cameo.

126 Albert Magnus, Book of Minerals trans. Dorothy Wyckoff (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), III.i.10.

he calls form in an Aristotelian sense.[127] He describes amethyst as very common in his day.[128] Indeed, amethyst and red jasper dominate the decoration of Charles IV's chapel of the Holy Cross at Karlštejn, southwest of Prague, a century later.[129] As with amethyst, Albert also expects the best bloodstone and sardonyx to come from India.[130] He also enthuses about the popularity of sardonyx cameos, mentioning that he has visited and authenticated the Ptolemy Cameo [Fig. 51] from the Three Kings Shrine in Cologne (cameo now in Vienna), and he notes that some such cameos are sometimes artificially manufactured.[131] The clerical scientist further explains the lifelike outline of a king's head in marble revetment cut at Venice as the uneven deposition of elements by vapors penetrating the native rock.[132] Although Pliny describes staining agates to make sardonyx, Albert does not say whether agates are stained in Europe. The sudden appearance of so many light figure on dark ground cameos in thirteenth-century Europe leaves their provenance open to question.

Several Medieval cameos feature religious subjects, but many depict animals or portrait busts in profile. Bust cameos in sardonyx were popular already since Carolingian times, while ruler images tended to appear mainly on seals.[133] The large number of eagles,

---

127 Ibid., II.i.1 & 4.

128 Ibid., II.ii.1.

129 Karl Möseneder, "Lapides vivi: Über die Kreuzkapelle der Burg Karlstein," Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft 34 (1981): 42-43. Hana Šedinová, "The Symbolism of the Precious Stones in St. Wenceslas Chapel," Artibus et Historiae 20/39 (1999): 75-94.

130 Albert Magnus, Book of Minerals trans. Dorothy Wyckoff (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), II.ii.1, 5, 13, and 17, respectively.

131 Ibid., II.iii.2.

132 Ibid., II.iii.1

133 Hans Wentzel, "Mittelalterliche Gemmen: Versuch einer Grundlegung," Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft 8 (1941): 45-98.

some grasping hares or snakes, has led scholars to connect this style with the Holy Roman Emperor, Frederick II, whose emblem was the eagle.[134] His notoriety in reviving Roman sculpture strengthens the intuition, and a contract of 1253 in Genoa lists his son's pawn or redemption of nearly one thousand gems just three years after his father's death.[135] Although these facts are circumstantial, they witness the boom in glyptic in a major Western European kingdom of the thirteenth century.

Daniel Cameos Between East and West

Compared to middle Byzantine cameos, most sardonyx and two-toned onyx cameos of Daniel – [Cat. 86, Fig. 39], [Cat. 87, Fig. 38], [Cat. 88, Fig. 41], [Cat. 89, Fig. 55], [Cat. 90, Fig. 56] and [Cat. 91, Fig. 40] - represent Western Medieval interest in early Christian glyptic. This group certainly follows the early Christian iconography that underlies Byzantine depictions of Daniel in the lions' den, although Byzantine precedents were more diverse than the two types of Daniel in sardonyx or onyx. The choice of sardonyx for most of these cameos also evokes Roman cameos rather than imitating contemporary Byzantine practice. Finally, the group of cameos that feature a dark figure against a light ground – [Cat. 89, Fig. 55], [Cat. 91, Fig. 40], [Cat. 108, Fig. 64], [Cat. 114], [Cat. 136], [Cat. 151, Fig. 53] and [Cat. 156] - display a striking new mode of highly plastic, almost monumental relief that seems more consistent with trends of late Medieval

134 Hans Wentzel, "Mittelalter und Antike im Spiegel kleiner Kunstwerke des 13. Jahrhunderts," in Studier tillägnade Henrik Cornell på sextioårsdagen (Stockholm, 1950): 89-92. Josef Deér, "Die Basler Löwenkamee und die süditalienische Gemmenschnitt des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des abendländischen Protorenaissance," Zeitschrift für schweizerische archeologie und Kunstgeschichte 14 (1953): 157-58. Elisabeth Nau, "Staufer-Adler," Jahrbuch der staatlichen Kunstsammlungen in Baden-W*ürttemberg* 5 (1968): 21-56. This imperial link was questioned by Rainer Kahsnitz, "Die Staufische Kameen," in Die Ziet der Staufer vol. 5 (Stuttgart: Württembergisches Landesmuseum, 1977): 492.

135 Eugene H. Byrne, "Some Mediaeval Gems and Relative Value," Speculum 10/2 (Apr., 1935): 178-180.

sculpture than with either Roman or Byzantine precedents.

By identifying suspicious features among cameos of a full-length Daniel orant, scholars have correctly separated them from the largely late Byzantine corpus of cameos that portray Daniel in bust. Only the Daniel cameo in Munich [Cat. 88, Fig. 41] includes the girt motif of eleventh- and twelfth-century Byzantine depictions, but the tri-colored technique of brown-blue-black arouses suspicion about its provenance.[136] The plasticity of the lions on the multi-layered sardonyx Daniel cameo Cividale [Cat. 86, Fig. 39] and the blue sardonyx in Munich [Cat. 88, Fig. 41] compare particularly well to the panther in Aachen [Fig. 52], which supposedly represents southern Italian work.[137]

By contrast, late Byzantine depictions of Daniel depict the prophet wearing a presumably Phrygian cap that could be mistaken for a late Medieval turban or toque, and they focus on attributes of his prophetic identity. An arched bloodstone [Cat. 152, Fig. 54] in the Cabinet des médailles, Paris, measuring 3.1 cm tall by 2.5 wide at its base and 0.85 cm thick, also features Daniel holding open a scroll.[138] A bloodstone with St. Hypatios on the reverse in the Troitse-Sergieva Lavra outside of Moscow [Cat. 153, Fig. 60]. Finally, a golden chalcedony cameo in the same monastery [Cat. 154, Fig. 59] features a youthful Daniel in bust, holding up his index finger in front of his chest.[139]

---

136 #80 "Kameo: Daniel in der Löwengrube," in Rom und Byzanz (Munich: Hirmer Vlg., 1998), 242. Martin Dennert locates its manufacture in thirteenth-century Venice based on this technique.

137 #V.14 in Kaiser Friedrich II. (1194-1250): Welt und Kultur des Mittelmeerraums ed. Mamoun Fansa and Karen Ermete (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2008), 377.

138 #320 in Byzance, 438.

139 L. M. Vorontsova, "Vizantiiskie kamei iz riznitsy Troitse-Sergievoi lavry [Byzantine Cameos from an Icon Revetment of the Trinity-Sergius Lavra]," in Vizantiiskaia ideia: Vizantiia v epokhu Komninov I Paleologov [The Byzantine Idea: Byzantium in the Epoch of the Komnenoi and Paleologoi] ed. Vera N. Zalesskaia (St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennyi Ermitazh, 2006): 11-31.

The Troitse-Sergieva Cameos

As we have seen already, the Byzantine cameos preserved in the Troitse-Sergieva Lavra provide precious examples of Byzantine glyptic that reasonably date to the late Byzantine period. A sapphire of the Archangel Michael the General [Cat. 140, Fig. 34] provides an excellent point of comparison, because the subject became popular in the twelfth century and continued through the Byzantine era. He holds a strongly tapered, triangular sword with a pronounced fuller running down the middle. These strongly tapered swords became popular from the middle of the thirteenth century in Western European circles and almost immediately in Byzantine circles, as well.[140] For example, the archangel also holds a noticeably tapered sword [Fig. 62] in a Byzantine fresco dated by inscription to 1288-1304 in the Kırk Dam Altı Kilise of Belisırama, Turkey.[141] By comparison with the long, narrowly tapered swords handled by the archangel in examples of the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries,[142] it is questionable whether the Byzantine fresco is meant to reflect Western models or whether the painter just hastily outlined a tapered sword of the period. The example in sapphire is nearly triangular though, like the Western examples and more acutely tapered than the contemporary Byzantine example. The relatively indistinct features of the face cannot be signs of wear, since only diamond and

140 Type XIV in Ewart Oakeshott, Records of the Medieval Sword (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1991), 115 ff. See specifically the seals from the Kingdom of Jerusalem attached to acts of 1269 by Balian d'Ibelin and his son, John IV, #154 and 95, respectively, in Gustave Schlumberger, Sigillographie de l'Orient latin (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1943).

141 Marcell Restle, Byzantine Wall Painting 1: Text trans. Irene R. Gibbons(Greenwich, CT; Recklinghausen: New York Graphic Society; Aurel Bongers, 1967), 176-177.

142 #36 (stone), 60 (wood), 80 (bone), 83 (bone), 101 (bone) in T. V. Nikolaeva, Drevnerusskaia melkaia plastika, XI-XVI vekov [Ancient minor sculpture, 11th-16th centuries] (Moscow: Sovetskaia khudozhnik, 1968). Although #83 comes from Suzdal c.1500, the rest seem to derive from the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries.

other varieties of corundum are hard enough to cut sapphire. The maladroit cutting of this gem consequently suggests a sudden availability of sapphire to lapidaries inexperienced working with it than with conscious artistic decisions in figure style. Despite its stylistic problems, this cameo from the turn of the fourteenth century lends weight to the presumption that the Troitse-Sergieva gems came to the monastery early in its history.

As noted in earlier analysis of the distribution of Byzantine cameos, scholars rightly think of the genre as one in bloodstone. Most Byzantine cameos are in bloodstone – as are nearly all the datable examples of the ninth through twelfth century. Another sapphire cameo of Christ Emmanuel in the Troitse-Sergieva Monastery [Cat. 110, Fig. 63] renders Him with an ovoid head in surprisingly high relief compared to his body.[143] Although the popularity of the subject dates to the twelfth century,[144] the strange sculptural style compares to a sardonyx example of Christ Emmanuel [Cat. 108, Fig. 64] in the Museumslandschaft Hessen at Kassel and more generally to a sapphire cameo of the Pantokrator in the Dumbarton Oaks collection [Cat. 121, Fig. 65].[145] Only a diamond scribe or corundum dust on the wheel would be capable of rendering the slender cross-nimbus and tituli of the sapphire Emmanuel cameo, making their use in the sardonyx example strange. Given the questionable provenance of several Byzantine cameos in the

143 Vorontsova, "Vizantiiskie kamei iz riznitsy Troitse-Sergievoi lavry," in Vizantiiskaia ideia [The Byzantine Idea], 11-12.

144 Rossitza B. Schroeder, "Images of Christ Emmanuel in Karanlik Kilise," Studies in Iconography 29 (2008): 46-48. The earliest example may be in the Karanlık Kilise in Cappadocia, although the traditional mid eleventh-century dating could be pushed as late as the early twelfth century. The absolute earliest possible datable image of Christ Emmanuel appears in a psalter dated by inscription to 1059. The illumination to Ps 43 in MS Vat. gr. 752 fol. 144 recto displays a young man without nimbus in the tympanum above a church door. Ernest T. De Wald ed. The Illustrations in the Manuscripts of the Septuagint 3: Psalms and Odes part 2: Vaticanus Graecus 752 (Princeton UP, 1942), 20 pl. XXVIII

145 #3 in Sacred Art, Secular Context.

Museumslandschaft Hessen in Kassel, the delicately inscribed nimbus and tituli likely indicate a local imitation of contemporary Byzantine cameos.

Finally, dating the sapphire Emmanuel and Michael after 1204 would place them clearly in the same period as the other cameos at the Troitse-Sergieva Monastery, which all were acquired presumably after the founding of the monastery in the middle of the fourteenth century. They could have been earlier than that event, but the sword of the archangel indicates that it was decades rather than centuries earlier. A sapphirine Theotokos Hagiosoritissa [Cat. 127, Fig. 66] on a paten in that monastery is interesting for clearly displaying the same rough-cut style, with a triangular nose and gouges for eyes, as two sapphires in Moscow's Kremlin Armory: the Virgin and Child Enthroned [Cat. 134, Fig. 67] on an icon revetment, and the Crucifixion [Cat. 122, Fig. 68] set in a pectoral cross to form a crucifix.[146]

The thirteenth-century mount of a bloodstone cameo [Cat. 118, Fig. 69] now in the Cabinet des Médailles best explains its late Byzantine representation of Christ Pantokrator: the cameo and its mount must be contemporary. The Latin inscription that surrounds it claims to stop hemorrhage, a common belief in Western European circles at the time.[147] Alcouffe compares the diamond-shaped head to Byzantine coins of Constantine VII (r. 945-959) in an unconvincing comparison. Ultimately, he sees the material of bloodstone, the iconography of the veiled hand and the technique as together

146 Irina A. Sterligova, "Maloizvestnye proizvedeviia srednevizantiiskoi gliptiki v Muzeiakh Moskovskogo Kremlia," Vizantiiskaia ideia [The Byzantine Idea], 183-184.

147 #191 in Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises, 281-82.

arguing for an Eastern provenance over its French mount and exceptional amalgam of features. His reasoning for a Byzantine provenance seems like special pleading when compared with the schematic style or ovoid heads of late Byzantine cameos. The parabolic chin, wavy upper lip and heavy "M" shape of the cameo in Paris appear derivative of a Byzantine style. This amalgam of style and mount could come from Crusader lands, where Byzantine and Gothic art objects traveled in the same circles.

Glass Cameos and the Byzantine Cameo

Despite their passing resemblance to cameos, the material, subjects and provenance of glass cameos are more reminiscent of pilgrim tokens, as in a glass cameo of St. Nicholas [Fig. 70].[148] We know from Archbishop Antonii of Novgorod's pilgrimage to the prophet's tomb in Constantinople that pilgrims of the late 12th century liked to collect tokens as a sign of their progress.[149] The glass cameos ascribed to Byzantium are as numerous in museums as gemstone cameos and usually consist of very dark to bright red opaque glass of about the same size as hardstone cameos. Although they often are compared to coins, seals, or glass stamped weights, they lack the raised internal rim that comes from pressing a stamp against a gathering of hot glass on an open surface. They could have been stamped in round, close-fitting cups, but their relatively thick and even sides resemble cameos rather than seals. A handful of glass cameos are translucent/transparent, but their Greek

148 Hans Wentzel, "Das Medaillon mit dem Hl. Theodor und die venezianischen Glaspasten im byzantinischen Stil," Festschrift für Erich Meyer zum sechzigsten Geburtstag 29. Oktober 1957 (Hamburg: Hauswedell Verl., 1959), 62.

149 George Majeska, Russian Travelers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1984), 327. The primary source is Kniga palomnik skazaniia mest' Sviatykh vo Tsaregrade Antoniia Arkhiepiskopa novogodskogo v 1200 gody [Guidebook of the story of the holy places in the imperial city of Antonii Archbishop of Novogod in the year 1200] ed. Hr. M. Loparev (St. Petersburg, 1899), 27. William of Malmesbury also mentions the relic of Daniel in Constantinople around 1120 in the, Gesta regum anglorum, IV.356.4.

titulature and Byzantine iconography suggests that they are the Byzantine exceptions among a largely Western Medieval corpus.[150] Unlike Byzantine gemstones and glass cameos, the Western glass cameos represent a diversity of saints popular among Western, as well as Eastern, Christians. Latin titulature appears on some of them, but glass cameos featuring scenes from the life of Christ or lacking titulature beyond "IC XC" often overlap discernible confessional boundaries.

With no datable examples of glass cameos, Hans Wentzel reasonably suggested their origin in Venice.[151] He noted their Western iconography and Latin titulature, as well as the reputation of Venice as a glassmaking center. On the other hand, Marvin Ross located them in the Byzantine east for their general stylistic similarity to Byzantine seals and cameos.[152] In accepting Wentzel's proposal that the translucent cameos examples were Byzantine, David Buckton proposed that these ten or so cameos could have come from Komnenian Constantinople and the remaining one hundred and sixty or more opaque glass cameos from thirteenth-century Venice.[153] Four of the five glass cameos in the Ashmolean Museum were purchased in Athens, Alexandria, Egypt and Jerusalem in the late nineteenth century, but their recent provenance is merely suggestive of their origins.[154]

---

150 Wentzel, "Medaillion mit dem Hl. Theodor und die venezianischen Glaspasten im byzantinischen Stil ," 55-56.

151 Ibid. For an overview of dating problems, see the recent article by Andrea Paribeni, "Materiali byzantini poco noti dei musei di Roma: Le paste vitree di Palazzo Venezia, " Rivista dell'Instituto d'archeologia e storia dell'arte 57 (2002): 453-454.

152 #105 in Marvin C. Ross ed., Catalogue of the Byzantine and Early Medieval Antiquities in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection 1: Metalwork, Ceramics, Glass, Glyptics, Painting (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1962), 88.

153 David Buckton, "The mass-produced Byzantine Saint," The Byzantine Saint (London: Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, 1981): 188.

154 Michael Vickers, "A Note on Glass Medallions in Oxford," Journal of Glass Studies 16 (1974): 18-21.

They could have been made anywhere with glass craftsmen, even if the preliminary stages of glass-making were realized in a distant locale. Although the Venetian glass industry is well-documented from the thirteenth century,[155] a more plausible source of glass cameos for Latin- and Greek-speaking pilgrims in the eastern Mediterranean is the crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem/Acre.

First, it is worth asking whether a middle Byzantine glassmaking industry existed at all, based solely on the artisanal complex discovered at Corinth.[156] After all, "...the miracle collection of St. Photeine, composed in the eleventh or twelfth century, which refers to a glass shop in Constantinople that caught fire...is the only surviving positive evidence of the manufacture of glass in the capital city."[157] The tenth-century Book of the Eparch likewise fails to list any glass workers among the regulated guilds of Constantinople.[158] While a site in Thessaloniki purports to contain waste from a ninth-century glass kiln and furnace, it

155 Marco Verità and Tullio Toninato, "A comparative analytical investigation on the origins of the Venetian glassmaking," Rivista della Stazione sperimentale del vetro 20 (1990): 169-176. For archival documentation see Luigi Zecchin, Vetro e vetrai di Murano: studi sulla storia del vetro vol. 1 (Venice: Arsenale, 1987).

156 Gladys Davidson Weinberg, "A Medieval Mystery: Byzantine Glass Production,"Journal of Glass Studies 17 (1975): 127-130. Compare the newer assessment by David Whitehouse, "The date of the 'Agora South Centre' workshop at Corinth," Archeologia medievale 20 (1993): 659-662, which places the site during the Latin occupation of the thirteenth century instead of the twelfth. More recent archeological connections of the blue glass bottle in Corinth to Crusader Cyprus are assessed in idem., "Byzantine Gilded Glass," in Gilded and Enamelled Glass from the Middle East ed. Rachel Ward (London: British Museum, 1998), 6. Maria G. Parani, "Representations of Glass Objects as a Source on Byzantine Glass: How Useful are They?," DOP 59 (2005), 166-168, makes an unconvincing comparison of a peculiar bottle type to one in a Byzantine manuscript in support of a twelfth-century dating. None of the authors consider the glass fragments at Corinth within the context of Levantine trade in cullet and raw glass.

157 Alice-Mary Talbot, "Evidence about Glass in Medieval Greek Texts from the Eighth to the Fifteenth Century," DOP 59 (2005): 141.

158 Johannes Koder ed. and trans., Das Eparchenbuch Leons des Weisen (Vienna: österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991).

remains unpublished.[159] Archaeological finds suggest that Byzantine artisans worked glass, but turning blocks of raw glass into bottles, bracelets or window panes is a more modest undertaking than supporting a glassmaking industry. In addition, glass cameos largely were made in opaque red or dark green rather than the translucent blue bracelets or the transparent green tint of window glass.

The best positive evidence for Byzantine expertise in glassmaking may come from the Pantokrator Monastery (now the Zeyrek Camii), whose stained glass, paint and lead cames seem to be Byzantine and therefore presumably from its founding around 1126.[160] The emminent glass historian of the Corning Museum of Glass, Robert Brill, tested the materials and compared statistical groupings with Byzantine glasses coming from a variety of sites and sources. Much of his interpretion consequently reflects how the Crusades altered glassmaking in the twelfth century, since his samples encompass the twelfth century within a survey period that dates back to the end of Antiquity. The potash content of vessels found on the Pantokrator site closely follows glass finds in medieval Tyre and window glass from the former monastery of Christ in Chora (now the Kariye Camii).[161] Where the Tyrian glasses match the general composition of Byzantine glasses, Tyrian glass samples are low in boron, confirming Brill's view that elevated boron levels are a telltale sign of glasses from Byzantine Anatolia, Cyprus and Greece. Even if the Pantokrator glass

159 Demetra Papanikola-Bakirtzi ed., Everyday Life in Byzantium (Athens: Hellenic Ministry of Culture, 2002), 119-120, #115.

160 Robert H. Brill, "Chemical Analyses of the Zeyrek Camii and Karye Camii Glasses," DOP 59 (2005): 215-217. Although his evidence is the strongest yet for Byzantine glass manufacture, Brill does not compare the elevated boron levels at these sites specifically with Levantine glasses. He only mentions that he has not found them in Islamic and Medieval glasses.

161 Compare Ian C. Freestone; Yael Gorin-Rosen; and Michael J. Hughes, "Primary Glass from Israel and the Production of Glass in Late Antiquity and the Early Islamic Period," in La route du verre: Ateliers primaires et secondaires du second millénaire av. J.-C. au Moyen Âge (Lyon: Maison de l'Orient, 2000), 74-75, figs. 2 & 4 with Brill, 219, figs. 6-8.

were produced locally though, it need not have been worked or painted by a Byzantine artisan. The technology of stained glass was just becoming widespread in Western Europe at that moment, so a Western master could easily have painted and fired these windows with the support of a Byzantine workshop.[162] Shards of stained glass from the Chora Monastery use Levantine soda glass but Western paints, so they may relate to Crusader occupation or even the renovation of around 1320 by Theodore Metochites.[163] For reasons of convenience, it still seems reasonable to assume that Byzantines must have worked glass for windows of new churches and for the tesserae in mosaics, but occasionally working glass does not imply an industry making glass.

A shipwreck of around 1025 on the southwest coast of Turkey shows a trade in frit and cullet from the Fatimid Syrian coast to the Thracian coast of the Sea of Marmara.[164] Glass finds of the eleventh through thirteenth centuries in Byzantine Sardis consist of bracelets probably made on site, some Islamic blown glassware and glass cake without any indication that glass was manufactured on site.[165] From various written sources, the rise of the Crusades seems increasingly to have fueled export of Levantine ashes, glass cake, cullet

162 For discussion of reuse or importation of glass, see Francesca Dell'Acqua, "Enhancing Luxury through Stained Glass, from Asia Minor to Italy," DOP 59 (2005): 207-210.

163 Dell'Acqua echoes the lack of firm conclusions by Brill and calls for more stylistic work to date the Chora fragments. The twelfth-century dating for both sites originates with Arthur H. S. Megaw, "Notes on Recent Work of the Byzantine Institute in Istanbul," DOP 17 (1963): 364-367. Because the two sites were patronized by imperial brothers, it is tempting to link their dates, as does Robert Ousterhout, Master Builders of Byzantium (Princeton UP, 1999), 154-56. Compare the early challenge of Jean Lafond, "Découverte de vitraux historiés du Moyen Age a Constantinople," Cahiers Archéologiques 18 (1968): 231-38.

164 George F. Bass et al., Serçe Limanı 2: The Glass of an Eleventh-Century Shipwreck (College Station, TX: Texas A & M UP, 2009).

165 Axel von Saldern, Ancient and Byzantine Glass from Sardis (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1980), 101-102.

and finished glasswares from ports like Antioch, Beirut, Tyre and Acre westward.[166]

The natural market for cheap glass pilgrim tokens with popular saints and scenes of the holy places would seem to be the Crusader lands, where glasswares, cullet and raw glass already were manufactured for export. Recently a similar motivation has been adduced for a group of byzantinizing ivories, probably of the late twelfth century or later.[167] Did pilgrimage drive a bilingual market situated in the Crusader states? Although not strictly comparable, stamped glass tokens with the titles of Ghaznavid rulers and courtly iconography appear in central Asia in the second half of the twelfth century, just a few decades before Abp. Daniel of Novgorod notes the popularity of pilgrimage tokens in Constantinople.[168] As we have seen, the glass industry for much of the eastern Mediterranean world in the middle Byzantine period seems to have been centered in the Levant. The Byzantines might have had the technical capability to make such tokens, but other Byzantine works show no interest in catering to Latin customers with Latin titulature or iconography. Although Byzantine glass weights survive from late Antiquity and a few Umayyad glass works incorporated hot stamped glass roundels, the rise of glass tokens with Christian subjects appears suddenly in the eastern Mediterranean region in the twelfth century. Given the sudden appearance of Crusaders in the region, Levantine glassmakers would have had the motivation to manufacture cheap pilgrimage tokens in Latin and Greek in regular quantities close to the source of raw glass production and pilgrimage sites.

---

166 Eliyahu Ashtor and Guidobaldo Cevidalli, "Levantine Alkaline Ashes and European Industries," Journal of European Economic History 12 (1983): 482-486. Stefano Carboni, Giancarlo Lacerenza and David Whitehouse, "Glassmaking in Medieval Tyre: The Written Evidence," Journal of Glass Studies 45 (2003): 147-149.

167 Maguire, "Ivories as Pilgrimage Art," DOP 61 (2009): 117-146.

168 Stefano Carboni, Glass from Islamic Lands (London: Thames & Hudson, 2001), 272-275, #73.

Others have posited Venice as a possible source of the glass cameos based on their titulature in both Greek and Latin.[169] Until studies of the composition of glass cameos suggest otherwise, Byzantium, the Crusader States and Venice all hypothetically could have manufactured the objects. The question then becomes one of motivation: why would Byzantine artisans make tokens with Latin titulature and Western saints or why would Venetians make tokens for visiting Eastern Christians? It seems strange to imagine Venice as a pilgrimage destination for Eastern Christians. Western Christians certainly passed through Constantinople by the boatload, but why then would they demand tokens with scenes from the life of Christ, such as the Nativity? The one destination for both Eastern and Western Christians that did have sites from the life of Christ, St. George and other shared Christian culture was the Holy Land. Since the Levantine ports were major centers of glass manufacture, it seems most logical to imagine the rise of glass cameos as a byproduct of the Crusades anchored in the Levant. Byzantine Christians presumably would have remained content to cut gemstone cameos as they had been doing for centuries. In any case, glass cameos appear too late and are too heterogeneous to help explain the Byzantine lapidary tradition.

Conclusions

Due to the explosion in stones and styles in the late Byzantine period, the criteria for judging Byzantine craftsmanship are few. A handful of cameos have an historical claim to represent the tradition of late Byzantine glyptic: cameos preserved on Mount Athos [Cat. 49], [Cat. 116], [Cat. 124]; and those incorporated into fourteenth-century church plate in the Troitse-Sergieva Lavra [Cat. 110, Fig. 63], [Cat. 111, Fig. 61], [Cat. 127, Fig.

169 See notes 148-151 at the beginning of the section.

66], [Cat. 154, Fig. 59], [Cat. 160]. Nearly all of them are cut in a schematic style with many parallel cuts. Most of them also reduce details, and the physiognomies are characterized by crudely delineated eyes and fingers. Some of them feature heads in high relief, while the majority tend to flatten figures in the curve of the gem. It would be tempting to view these trends as a decline in quality, but so many of these late Byzantine examples are cut in very hard stones that it also may reflect shifting tastes. As jewelers began to cut hard stones, the crude style they initially adopted also influenced their cutting in traditional stones, such as jasper. Still, the agate cameo of the Hodegetria in the Troitse-Sergieva Lavra [Cat. 131, Fig. 92] has fine detail and rounded volumes, although the button-like eyes are a common trait of the period. Since it remains impossible to provenance the cameos, the late Byzantine style of glyptic seems a choice rather than a sudden break in the lapidary tradition between the middle and late styles.

Finally, it is worth considering which cameos clearly are not Byzantine craftsmanship and what they might tell us about Byzantine intentions toward the icon versus those of later times. The first criterion that emerges from this study is that Byzantine cameos were essentially icons, so narrative scenes are not likely Byzantine works – especially those with multiple figures. As icons they were not used as seals: the small corpus of gemstone seals largely is an early Byzantine phenomenon, and lead seals almost entirely replace them after Iconoclasm. The exceptional seal of St. Theodore Slaying the Hydra [Cat.171, Fig. 71] probably is a post-Byzantine Greek work, with a hydra that looks like post-Byzantine representations of the apocalyptic beast and Theodore in a twisting stance holding only a lance. Although it is cut into a fine onyx of three layers, the intaglio is cut only into the dark top layer of the blank. As icons Byzantine cameos also exclude imperial

iconography, such as the intaglio of Iconoclast Emperors Holding a Patriarchal Cross [Cat.167, Fig. 72], which is spurious based on its historically incongruous titulature.[170] This criterion also suggests that the carnelian intaglio of a Rider Slaying a Dragon [Cat.107, Fig. 73] and the jadeite Rider Jousting [Cat.158, Fig. 74] are Western works never intended for a Byzantine audience.

A cameo of Theodore [Cat. 170, Fig. 75] has been dated to the late Byzantine period due to several iconographic anomalies, but it is so ignorant of Byzantine conventions that it hardly can be Byzantine work or a Medieval work after a Byzantine exemplar. St. Theodore, either the recruit or general, is rarely depicted without a beard. He also is reliably pictured with weapons from the middle of the eleventh century on. In fact, the figure's curly locks and clean-shaven face look like the St. George copied by a western artist in the Freiburg Pattern Book. The right hand seems poised to carry a metal spear, if only the hand were drilled through, an addition that would be groundbreaking for Byzantine glyptic. The high, puffy cheek bones particularly seem Western Medieval. The strange "~" through the "Θ that begins his name, as well as the odd combination of "ΑΔ" are another reason for caution regarding the work's Byzantine provenance.

More difficult to isolate is the bulbous style of late cameos in amethyst, sapphire and sardonyx – [Cat. 108, Fig. 64], [Cat. 110, Fig. 63], [Cat. 121, Fig. 65], [Cat. 123] and [Cat. 143], [Cat. 151, Fig. 53], which cannot easily be assigned to Byzantium, Russia or the Holy Roman Empire. The style does not exhibit affiliations with Hohenstaufen examples or French Gothic cameos, so their iconic poses have suggested to curators that they are Byzantine. While their high relief might relate to the very plastic rendering of

170 Phillip Grierson, Byzantine Coins (Berkeley: University of California, 1982), 39 and 154-156.

John the Forerunner made for Alexios V Doukas around 1205 [Cat. 102, Fig. 22], the chalcedony of Daniel from the Troitse-Sergieva Lavra [Cat. 154, Fig. 59] still builds up the body of the prophet in several distinct planes like middle Byzantine examples. The ovoid heads of the Pantokrator in Washington [Cat.121, Fig. 65] or Daniel in Kassel [Cat. 151, Fig. 53] may be byzantinizing works of northern Europe or come from a Byzantine territory, but they retain the iconic features of Byzantine cameos in a local style.

3 A Byzantine Theology of Stone

Because the story of Byzantine art generally and the Christian icon specifically has proceeded for a long time from the theologies of Christian writings, scholars remain keen to reach conceptually through the veil that Iconoclasm cast over artistic production in the eighth century of our era.[171] Questions about the continuity of artistic forms from Antiquity into the Middle Ages need not detain this study, the focus of which is material from the ninth through the fourteenth centuries in the Byzantine heartland.[172] What arose out of the social ferment of Iconoclasm was a recognizable artistic genre of icons in a number of media defined visually by a figure framed against an indeterminate ground and by ecclesiastical prescriptions for their veneration.[173] Constantinopolitan Christians meanwhile continued to live in a city filled with Antique sculptures of all sorts,[174] which does not seem to have affected the output of icons in relief after Iconoclasm. These early

171 See Charles Barber, Figure and Likeness: The Limits of Representation (Princeton UP, 2002) for theoretical issues and Leslie Brubaker and John Haldon eds., Byzantium in the Iconoclastic Era (ca. 680-850): The Sources, An Annotated Survey (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001) for the archaeological context.

172 Paul Lemerle, Byzantine Humanism: the first phase: notes and remarks on education and culture in Byzantium from its origins to the 10th century trans. Helen Lindsay and Ann Moffatt (Canberra: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1986), provides a classic position and necessary context.

173 Jeffrey C. Anderson's reflection on "The Byzantine Panel Portrait before and after Iconoclasm," in Ousterhout and Brubaker's The Sacred Image East and West (Urbana: Illinois, 1995), 25-55, is rare in using icons themselves to probe the transition from Antique to Medieval portraits. Henry Maguire has explained the formal and conceptual aspects of the new portraiture as a system in Icons of their Bodies: Saints and Their Images in Byzantium (Princeton, 1996).

174 Cyril Mango, "Antique Statuary and the Beholder," DOP 17 (1963): 53-75, introduced the problem, although his attempt to separate high and low social attitudes toward sculpture has been revised by Helen Saradi-Mendelovici, "Christian Attitudes toward Pagan Monuments in Late Antiquity and their Legacy in Later Byzantine Centuries," DOP 44 (1990): 47-61. A key primary source is Constantinople in the early eighth century: the Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai : introduction, translation, and commentary eds. Averil Cameron and Judith Herrin (Leiden: Brill, 1984). Liz James goes so far as to portray these statues as neutral sources of power, "Pray Not to Fall into Temptation and Be on Your Guard': Pagan Statues in Christian Constantinople," Gesta 35/1 (1996): 12-20.

relief icons included predominantly metal,[175] marble,[176] ivory,[177] and perhaps, even wooden icons.[178]

Iconophile formulations often speak of painting (ζωγραφία) or colors, which could apply to enamel work, as well as painting and mosaic.[179] However, their justifications for representing sacred figures in physical matter clearly were meant to cover a variety of media and uses. In fact, the iconoclastic Council of Hieria (754) made an exception for sacred vessels and vestments, requiring iconoclastic bishops to obtain patriarchal approval before disposing of figured items, as well as prohibiting the imperial authorities from seizing church plate under the cover of piety.[180] This curious exception suggests that Iconoclastic objections to sacred imagery were not as categorical as the extant anathemas of the council suggest, which banned representation of holy persons in all media as demonic idols. The Second Council of Nicea (787) explicitly prescribed the production of holy images "made of colours, pebbles, or any other material that is fit".[181] In his initial defense of Christian images, John of Damascus quoted Leontius of Neapolis'

175 Bissera Pentcheva, "The Performative Icon," Art Bulletin 88/4 (Dec., 2006): 631-655.

176 Richard Lange, Die byzantinische Reliefikone (Recklinghausen: Verl. Aurel Bongers, 1964).

177 Adolph Goldschmidt with Kurt Weitzmann, Die byzantinischen Elfenbeinskulpturen des X-XIII Jahrhunderts (Berlin: Deutscher Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft, 1979; repr. B. Cassirer, 1930-34) and Anthony Cutler, The Hand of the Master: Craftsmanship, Ivory, and Society in Byzantium (9th-11th centuries) (Princeton UP, 1994).

178 The few surviving examples in wood date from the Latin conquest (1204) or later, which has led scholars to connect the phenomenon with the event. Accidents of survival may have left only later examples to witness to the medium. Compare the survival of painted panels in Kurt Weitzmann, The Monastery of Saint Catherine at Mount Sinai, the icons (Princeton UP, 1976).

179 Charles Barber, Figure and Likeness: On the Limits of Representation in Byzantine Iconoclasm (Princeton UP, 2002), 127-135.

180 These definitions were preserved only in the rebuttal of II Nicea, Volume 6, 329E-333B. Translation in Daniel Sahas, Icon and Logos: Sources in Eighth-Century Iconoclasm (U of Toronto, 1986), 149-51.

181 Ibid., 377D (p. 179). See analysis of Photius' distinction between matter and image in Barber, Figure and Likeness, 113-14.

lost treatise against the Jews regarding veneration of the cross.[182] The point of the passage is that relics, such as the miracle-working bones of Elisha, or natural elements, such as the rock at Meribah, could become vehicles of divine grace as surely as pictures. In this regard, the council's acceptance of icons acknowledged the conceptual category of depiction as open to divine grace along with what must have seemed the natural channel of material objects, such as relics.[183]

This indifference toward the materiality of holy things is noticeable in the arguments and definitions of the iconoclastic debates, which continually seek to uncover universal truths about representing spiritual beings rather than to explain the current uses of sacred objects. Even in debating the veneration of images with a greeting (ἀσπασμός), iconoclasts and iconophiles focused on the worshiper's intentions rather than the image's power. The definitions of II Nicea strenuously insisted that images were not the same as idols but did not elaborate exactly what idols were considered to be, since the problem was defined in terms of improper devotion.[184] Since Roman times, the Greek word, eidolon, was understood to refer to cult statues, in the sense of a false or malignant representation of deity.[185] Stone statues in the round would have qualified in the Byzantine mind as idols

182 John of Damascus, Three Treatises On the Divine Images ed. and trans. Andrew Louth (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003), I.56.

183 Peter Brown's fundamental study on The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity (U of Chicago, 1981) problematized relics in late Antiquity. However, Robin Cormack has demonstrated how intertwined relics were with images in this period in Writing in Gold: Byzantine Society and its Icons (Oxford UP, 1985).

184 See Henry Maguire, Icons of their Bodies: Saints and their Images in Byzantium (Princeton UP, 1996) for a clear exposition of how Byzantine artisans interpreted the council in concrete artistic production.

185 "Eidolon," G.W.H. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961), 408. Compare the Wisdom of Solomon 14, 1 Cor 8, and Acts 17: 16-31. The more generic term for a statue was agalma, which early Christian writers treated with nearly as much contempt. In the Septuagint though, it only occurs in the plural and in the OT: Isa 19:3, 21:9 and 2 Macc 2:2. See "Agalma," Lampe, 6.

in the context of religious devotion.

Proof of how totalizing and coherent the Byzantine rationale for icons became can be found in the equally coherent body of profane art that just as systematically broke the rules of the icon with subjects like figural nudity, spastic contortions, and strange hybrids.[186] The hybridization and unnatural transformations of the Greco-Roman deities was a hallmark of idols, against which Christian art officially set itself as the record of an historical god-man and his followers.[187] Christianity, though, had inherited Classical texts that normalized religious and imperial sculpture and which remained the standard for Byzantine literary production. Although Christianity's struggle against the imperial cult animated the later narrative of the church's triumph, its own arts naturally grew from the shared visual culture of imperial Rome.[188]

The Byzantine reception of Greco-Roman art and the continuing use of earlier strategies, such as personification, was decidedly ambivalent though.[189] In an often cited example, Constantine Rhodian's description of the bronze doors on the old senate house included an appreciative description of their reliefs, which depicted snaked-legged giants

---

186 See the introduction to Eunice Dauterman Maguire and Henry Maguire, Other Icons: Art and Power in Byzantine Secular Culture (Princeton UP, 2007), 1-3.

187 Ibid., 6-8.

188 Compare Thomas G. Mathews, The Clash of the Gods 2nd ed. (Princeton UP, 1999), with Robin Jensen, Understanding Early Christian Art (London: Routledge, 2000).

189 Hans Belting, "Kunst oder Objekt-Stil? Fragen zur Funktion der 'Kunst' in der 'Makedonischen Renaissance," in Byzanz und der Western: Studien der Kunst des europäischen Mittelalters ed. Irmgard Hutter (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1984): 65-83, and Paul Speck, "Ikonoklasmus und die Anfänge der makedonischen Renaissance," Poikila Byzantina 4 (1984): 175-210. The Iconophiles testified to iconoclastic patronage of images of crosses and animals. Nothing would have precluded images of secular subjects during this time, so it seems illogical to argue that all artistic activity ceased. Iconophiles would have melted and refashioned metalworks; reset mosaics or lived with them; and kept using illuminated manuscripts with unoffensive imagery, so it seems unlikely that much Iconoclastic art will be found. Even in figural art, artisans could have continued to portray the emperor, which makes arguments of radical artistic change difficult to prove or disprove.

and other giants battling titans, while ridiculing the narrative's historical claims as patently absurd.[190] A more evocative contemporary anecdote comes from the life of St. Andrew the Fool, who contrasts the visible idol with the hidden sin of a bystander.[191] The bystander criticizes the holy fool for indulging his curiosity to look at the art, which suggests that Byzantine Christians recognized a certain fascination for their pre-Christian past. While the saint terms the scene a visible idol, he condemns the man's hypocrisy in biblical terms for being part of the viper's brood that cleans the outside of a cup but neglects the filth inside (Mt 23:25 ff.). It is not just the intellectual or esthete who can separate art from ideology, but even the saint makes the distinction! Despite a deep ideological association of statuary with idolatry, the official position of the Christian Church towards images that emerged from Iconoclasm surprisingly attached no special significance to sculpture generally or stone specifically.[192]

Biblical Interpretations

Historians tend to assume that materials were important to the theological project of icons, but evidence for a Byzantine theology of sculpture or stone does not arise much

190 Eunice Dauterman Maguire & Henry Maguire, Other Icons: Art and Power in Byzantine Secular Culture (Princeton UP, 2007), 24-25.

191 The Life of St. Andrew the Fool ed. And trans. Lennart Ryden vol 2. (Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Uppsaliensis, 1995), 140-143.

192 It is important to note that the immediate impact of the libri carolini in the development of Western image theory now seems small, according to Paul Meyvaert, "Medieval Notions of Publication: The 'Unpublished' Opus Caroli regis contra synodum and the Council of Frankfort (794)," Journal of Medieval Latin 12 (2002): 78-98, and Opus Caroli regis contra synodum (Libri Carolini) ed. Ann Freeman with Paul Meyvaert MGH, Legum sectio III, Concilia tomus 2, suppl. 1 (Hannover: Hahn, 1998). The Roman Church strongly supported the definition of II Nicea, while the Frankish rejection of the council was based largely on a deficient translation of the council's definition. As Beate Fricke has argued, the Carolingian church turned increasingly to bust reliquaries and sculpture to authenticate the sacred figural image, "Fallen idols and risen saints: western attitudes toward the worship of images and the 'cultura veterum deorum'," in Negating the Image: Case Studies in Iconoclasm eds. Anne McClanan and Jeffrey Johnson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005): 67-95.

within the discourse of the Byzantines themselves. Biblical commentaries and theological treatises of the Byzantine period constitute two important sources of this discourse. The Old Testament, which a Byzantine Christian would have read in the Greek translation of the Septuagint, fundamentally prohibits making any likeness of living things. Exodus 20:4-5 and Deuteronomy 5:8-9 command, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of that in heaven above, or that in the earth beneath, or that in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them." Certainly after Iconoclasm, the Old Testament was read only sparingly in Byzantine church services,[193] so Byzantine Christians would not have had the opportunity to hear these passages read in church.[194] Old Testament commentaries were available to some literate Byzantines, although little work has been done on the survival of Old Testament commentaries, either as volumes by individual authors or as compilations of patristic commentaries for a given verse called a catena.[195]

The future patriarch, Photius, left a valuable record of his own reading not long after Iconoclasm in the form of literary notes entitled the Bibliotheca, that is library.[196] Among the works that he read were Hippolytus' Commentary on Daniel (CPG 1872),

193 Juan Mateos, La célébration de la parole dans la liturgie byzantine, 191: Orientalia Christian Analecta (Rome: Pontificale Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1971), 130-133.

194 Idem, Le Typicon de la Grande Église, OCA 165-166 (Rome: Pontificale Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1962-63). Presumably the typikon of the Great Church reflects cathedral (and parish) practice throughout the Byzantine world, although that hardly is certain. Abp. Symeon of Thessaloniki (+1429) complained that the monastic typikon of Mt. Athos had nearly replaced the sung services of the cathedral rite by his time.

195 For brief but helpful overview see Natalio Fernández Marcos, The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible rev. (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 287-302.

196 Paul Lemerle, Byzantine Humanism: The First Phase trans. Helen Lindsay and Ann Moffatt (Canberra: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1986), convincingly places the work in Photius' early years, around 836.

Theodoret's Commentary on Daniel (CPG 6027) and that author's Questions on the Octateuch (CPG 6200), but surprisingly no works on the Psalms. The various scholia of Procopius that Photius read probably included notes on Old Testament works, especially the Psalms, since Procopius was instrumental in creating one of the first catenae on the Psalms.[197] Interpretations attributed to John Chrysostom, Theodoret of Cyrus and Hesychius of Jerusalem became dominant sources for Byzantine interpretation of the Psalms in the catenae of the Byzantine period.[198] As late as the early fourteenth century, Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos noted in his monumental Ecclesiastical History that Theodoret had authored important expositions of difficult passages of the Old Testament, as well as commentaries on the Prophets and the Psalms.[199]

However, these commentators and later compilers show surprisingly little interest in stone as a material or as a spiritual temptation. Gregory of Nyssa simply extends the Pauline association of the rock on Mount Choreb with Christ (1 Cor 10:1-5), satisfying the baptized Christian's longing by a spiritual communion with God the Father.[200] He largely passes over the second miraculous draft, except that the original grace of the first is restored by repentance, which probably alludes to the mystery of confession.[201] Part of his assumption may be that what we commonly call 'godhead' (theotes) is an instrumental

197 Gilles Dorival, Les chaînes exégétiques grecques sur les Psaumes Tome 1 (Leuven: Peeters, 1986), VII-XII and 99-115, maintains that Procopius created the catena.

198 Gilles Dorival, "La postérité littéraire des chaînes exégétique grecques," *Revue des études byzantines* 43 (1985): 221-224.

199 Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos, Die Kirchengeschichte des Nikephoros Callistus Xanthopulus und ihre Quellen ed. Günter Gentz with Friedhelm Winkelmann (Berlin: Akademic Verl., 1966), Book 14.54 (PG 146: 1258).

200 Gregory of Nyssa, Life of Moses trans., intro. and notes Abraham J. Malherbe and Everett Ferguson. (NY: Paulist Press, 1978), II.139.

201 Ibid., II.270.

power (energia) of the transcendent deity working the divine will in an object.[202] He also viewed Old Testament references to idols and other "gods" in a similar manner. As David Bradshaw writes, "[Gregory] cites various passages in which Scripture refers to idols and demons as gods, along with the peculiar words of God to Moses, 'I have given thee as a god to Pharoah' (Exodus 7:10)."[203]

Gregory Nazianzen, duly called "the Theologian" after his influence in the Christian East, also relates his mystical ascent to God with the rock in which God hid Moses as he passed by the prophet.[204] He mentions that those who are spiritually unclean for the ascent risk being crushed, which may be an oblique reference to the stone not cut by human hands in Daniel or may just refer to the stoning mentioned in Leviticus. He further expresses the intention for his sermon "to be engraved on solid tables of stone and on both sides of these because the Law has an obvious and hidden aspect." What he means by the Law becomes even more tantalizing, when the theologian describes entering the mystagogical cloud and looking on the divine being.

> But when I directed my gaze I scarcely saw the averted figure of God, and this whilst sheltering in the rock, God the Word incarnate for us. Peering in I saw not the nature prime...but the grandeur, or as divine David calls it the "majesty" inherent in the created things he brought forth and governs...All these indications of himself that he has left behind him are God's "averted figure." Thus and thus only, can you speak of God, be you Moses, Pharoah's "God," had you reached, like Paul, the third heaven and heard ineffable mysteries, had you even transcended it, deemed worthy of an angel's or an archangel's station and rank.

As for Paul writing to the Corinthians, Gregory begins from the intuition that "the rock is

202 David Bradshaw, Aristotle East and West: Metaphysics and the Division of Christendom (Cambridge UP, 2004), 163.

203 Gregory of Nyssa, On the Holy Spirit (NPNF 5, 329) and Contra Eunomium, II.149, 298-99, 304, III.5.58.

204 Gregory Nazianzen, "On the Doctrine of God" in On God and Christ trans. and ed. Lionel Wickham (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 2002), Oration 28.2-3 (37-39).

Christ." Just as Christ is the animating force that gushes water for the thirsting Israelites, Christ is the rock with which the mystagogue is necessarily clothed in order to see divine things. As a principle it certainly suggests the potential of stone to communicate the divine Law and person, but Byzantine writers did not pick up on Gregory's pregnant language. Earlier concerns were generally apologetic and didactic rather than aesthetic.

Cyril of Alexandria likewise interprets the rock as unbreakable and immovable in an analogy to the divine nature.[205] He does not take up the prohibition of idols in Leviticus 26:1 or return to the expanded account of Meribah in Numbers 20.[206] Procopius of Gaza's catena quotes Cyril's interpretation of Exodus 17:6 practically verbatim but skips the second miraculous draft of his recent predecessor.[207] For Cyril as for the Cappadocians, the late Antique debate revolves around answering epistemological questions embedded in language, especially those of Eunomius.[208] The elder bishop had questioned the possibility of communicating divine knowledge in human terms. The challenge would bedevil Pseudo-Dionysius as to how a transcendent God could be "the rock" in a real sense that was true to divine revelation in the Scriptures beyond poetic metaphor.[209] The truth of the God of the Bible, not the natural properties of desert rocks, was at stake for Christians as they increasingly answered Platonism, magic and other intellectual currents of late Antiquity.

---

205 Cyril of Alexandria, Glaphyra in Exodum, Book III in PG 69: 496.

206 Versification follows Rahlf's Septuaginta and translations follow the King James Version of 1768, except where the KJV departs from the LXX text. I have translated such discrepancies to conform more literally to the Greek of the LXX.

207 Procopius of Gaza, Catena in PG 87,1: 594.

208 John Behr, The Nicene Faith 2: One of the Holy Trinity (Crestwood, NY: SVS Press, 2004), 282 ff.

209 Pseudo-Dionysius, The Divine Names, 6.596c in Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works ed. Colm Luibheid (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1987), 56.

Since late Antiquity, Christian commentators approached the events of Israel's Exodus through the ecclesiastical typology of St. Paul's first letter to the Corinthians 10:1-5, rather than through a strictly historical or literary reading of the Octateuch.[210] Paul seems to conflate the appearance of God on the rock of Mount Choreb in Exodus 17:6 with the sanctification of God at Kadesh in Numbers 20:13.[211] The point of his interpretation is that the Israelites did not have faith in their "baptism" in the Red Sea, nor in the miraculous feeding with manna or the miraculous draft from a rock. The implication is that their lack of faith made God's vivifying sanctification ineffective, just as faith expressed through the analogous Christian rites of baptism and Eucharist makes grace accessible to Christians. Following the Pauline interpretation, John Chrysostom focused on the ethical or ecclesiological implications of Christ as the miraculous rock of Meribah. In addition to glossing the Exodus and desert miracles in terms of Baptism and Eucharist, he further interpreted the death of the Israelites as a warning to all who would enjoy God's gifts of grace without manifesting the "fruits of love."[212] He emphasized that the death of the Israelites should keep later generations mindful of their own impending death and judgment.

Theodoret likewise interprets the miraculous spring as the Eucharistic blood of Christ that the newly baptized enjoyed immediately after their immersion.[213] The

210 Frances Young, Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture (Cambridge UP, 1996).

211 Both events take place in the wilderness of Sin, and both end in the labeling of the miraculous waters as Meribah, which is described as meaning quarrel. Modern scholarship views the more charged confrontation of Moses, Israel and God in Numbers as a post-exilic reworking of the earlier account in Exodus. See "Meribah," Anchor Bibsle Dictionary ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), IV, 746.

212 John Chrysostom, In Epistulam I ad Corinthios, Homily 27 (PG 61: 190-91).

213 Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Questions on the Octateuch trans. and ed. John F. Petruccione and Robert C. Hill (Washington: Catholic University of America, 2007), Question 27 (PG 80: 258).

subsequent paragraph answers, "for what reason the rock is named Christ," simply claiming that the relationship is typological like the Red Sea and Christian baptism. From the questions that he felt compelled to address, it seems that Theodoret's flock was perplexed by the relationship between the historical events of the Old Testament and their Christian fulfillment, rather than by sacred figures in stone. Theodoret's ecclesiastical interpretation is important, because he serves as a bellwether of mainstream early Christian interpretation. He not only represents the Antiochene tradition but also consciously drew on leading commentaries of the Alexandrian tradition, including his sometime adversary Cyril of Alexandria. As the Bibliotheca of Photius attests, Theodoret remained a major source for Byzantine interpretations of the Old Testament. The same list refers to various sermons and miscellaneous homilies by John Chrysostom that might have included his very popular works on the Pauline epistles.

Byzantine theologians, such as Theophylact of Ochrid, commented on the New Testament and Psalms, but largely ignored the rest of the Old Testament. Their priorities may to some extent reflect the imperially-funded chairs of theology in the middle Byzantine period, and perhaps by extension, Byzantine society's priorities.[214] The Late Antique catenae of patristic commentary seem to have satisfied the Byzantine need to understand the Old Testament types as fulfilled in the Christian mysteries (the Greek term for sacraments). The Byzantine liturgical commentators explained the Divine Liturgy in terms of events in the life of Christ, increasingly to the neglect of the anagogical

214 Robert Browning, "The patriarchal school at Constantinople in the twelfth century", Byzantion **32**: 167–202.

interpretations popular in late Antiquity.[215] At the same time, a small body of Old Testament paramoia, or parables, illuminated the Gospel events of the Great Feasts with typological connections.[216] As an ivory box in the Palazzo Venezia Museum demonstrates, the history of Israel was valuable to Byzantine rulers both as a prelude to and model for contemporary events.[217] The Paris Psalter also deploys the life of David in ways that heighten imperial connections with the paradigmatic Christian king.[218] Recent studies suggest more specifically that its appeal lay at least as much in the classicizing style of the miniatures as in the sacral authority of the scriptural king.[219] As successors to the Israelites, the Byzantines seem to have needed the Old Testament only as a shadow of their own glories.

Even in the isolated cases where the New Testament dealt with stone, the ethical and liturgical interests of Byzantine commentators did not lend themselves to the exegesis of stone as a spiritual entity. In only one instance does the New Testament explicitly mention the moral hazard of stone idols, which is Luke's report of Paul's talks with the Greek philosophers of the Areopagus. The apostle to the gentiles claimed there that "we

---

215 Germanus of Constantinople, On the Divine Liturgy intro. and trans. Paul Meyendorff (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984), 52 ff.

216 For example, the reading of Ezekiel 43:-44: concerning the gate that remains shut, signifies the perpetual virginity of Mary and is read for the Nativity of the Virgin (September 8), Presentation of the Lord (February 2), and Dormition of the Virgin (August 15). See Mateos, Typicon de la Grande *É*glise.

217 Henry Maguire, "The Art of Comparing in Byzantium," Art Bulletin 70/1 (Mar., 1988): 91-94.

218 Kurt Weitzmann, "The Character and Intellectual Origins of the Macedonian Renaissance" in Studies in Classical and Byzantine Manuscript Illumination ed. Herbert L. Kessler (U of Chicago, 1971): 176-184 trans. of "Geistige Grundlagen und Wesen der Makedonischen Renaissance" in Arbeitsgemeinschaft f*ü*r Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen 107 (Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1963); Hugo Buchthal, "The Exaltation of David," Journal for the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 37 (1974): 330-333.

219 Hans Belting, "Kunst oder Objekt-Stil?" 74 ff., and Henry Maguire, "Style and Ideology in Byzantine Imperial Art," Gesta 28/2 (1989): 217-220.

ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device (Acts 17:29)." If the Byzantine commentator had possessed lingering doubts about stone's appropriateness for conveying Christian images, he could have found no clearer prohibition than the first authorized Church history. In a typical example of Byzantine commentary though, Theophylact of Ochrid writing around 1100 emphasized that God could not be contained even in the temple of Jerusalem, such is the deity's universal and eternal nature.[220] The archbishop passed over the topic of Christian images in a silence that likely strikes post-Reformation scholars as suspicious, but modern reactions reveal modern perceptions more than Byzantine intentions.

As modern critics often note, Byzantine commentators did not simply read biblical texts as individuals, but they leaned heavily on John Chrysostom as a guide to the normative point of biblical texts.[221] This stereotype does not do justice to the fact that each later commentator appropriated Chrysostom's sense personally, expanding or paring the patristic source greatly into a new shape that gives a new sense of what is important in a particular biblical passage. Like Chrysostom's interpretation of 1 Corinthians, Patriarch Photius highlights that the rock was perceptible to human senses but that the miracle was an act of grace and not of the rock's proper nature.[222] This observation is not as striking within the context of Chrysostom's much longer commentary, but it consumes a third of

220 Oecumenius of Trikka, Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles in PG 118: 240-42, and Theophylact of Ochrid, Exposition on the Acts of the Apostles in PG 125: 748-49.

221 Karl Staab, Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche (Münster: Aschendorff, repr. 1984), viii, goes too far in claiming that Byzantine commentators merely paraphrase Chrysostom, although they appropriate him extensively. As Photius' list shows, the educated Byzantine expositor read a number of fathers and made his own synthesis, even when he relied heavily on a particular patristic commentary.

222 Ibid., 564: "αἰσθητὴ μεν ἠην ἡ πέτρα δηλονότι, ἡ τὸ ὑδωρ τοιης Ἰσραηλίταις ἀναβλύσασα, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τῃ̃ οἰκεία φύσει τουητο ἔβλυσεν, ἀλλὰ τῃ̃ δυνάμει τηης κατ' ἐνέργειαν παρούσης πνεύματι τῃ̃ πνευματικηης πέτρας." Mateos, Typicon, OCA 165: 180, specifies the reading of I Cor 10:1-4 only for the Divine Liturgy that forms the culmination of the vigil of Theophany.

Photius' shorter one. The Byzantine patriarch's eagerness to separate divine grace from the nature of the rock only makes sense in light of the natural history that artesian springs sometimes gush from rocks in the Sinai desert or against the philosophical assumption that material indeed could be inhabited by supernatural forces, whether for good or evil. Given what has been said above about Byzantine views on pagan sculpture, it seems likely that Photius meant to distance supernatural forces from the natural world. He likewise avoids challenging the biblical account with a purely natural explanation of the phenomenon. The ambiguity of the passage does not allow any further conclusions regarding his attitude toward materials or sacred images, though.

In the middle of the eleventh century, Christopher of Mytilene wrote a poem describing the streams of miraculous oil (myron) that flowed from St. Panteleimon's relics as the fulfillment of the earlier water from the rock.[223] Theophylact follows a similar logic.[224] The newly baptized immediately receives Holy Communion in analogy to the Israelite's miraculous feeding and watering in the desert. However, these things were through a spiritual grace, even if they were physically perceptible, "nourishing the [Israelites'] souls along with the body." This last quote is from Chrysostom, although it acquires much more prominence in the short paragraph of Theophylact than it held in the middle of Chrysostom's much longer explanation. He focuses on the manner in which the holy mysteries become the point of solidarity not only with the church, as Christ's body, but also with the person of Christ. This need to explain salvation in both physical and

223 #89 in Christophori Mitylenaii Versuum Variorum Collection Cryptensis ed. Marc de Groote 74:Corpus Christianorum (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), 82-83. J. A. Cramer, Anecdota graeca e codd. Manuscriptis bibliothecae regiae parisiensis (Oxford, 1841), 332, mistakenly ascribes the poem to John Geometres.

224 Theophylact of Ochrid, Expositio in Epistolam I ad Corinthiam 10:3 in PG 124: 680.

ecclesiastical terms might have felt urgent in the Bulgarian marches, where the dualist teachings of the Bogomils were strongest, although Theophylact makes no clear reference to them or to dualist Paulicians in nearby Thrace.[225]

Because of Theophylact's possible concern with dualist heresy in the interpretation of St. Paul, his lack of engagement with contemporary problems of sacred representation is interesting. The heresy of Leo of Chalcedon was condemned in 1094 or 1095, about the time of Theophylact's activity.[226] In the face of the imperial seizure of metal icons and revetments in 1081, Metropolitan Leo of Chalcedon claimed increasingly that icons became holy in themselves. The Council of Blachernae in 1094 or 1095 finally condemned any connection between the icon and the divine grace bestowed by the person represented in it. Their definition of the separation between the image and materiality, perhaps, goes further than any other Byzantine statement in circumscribing the icon as a conceptual category that functions strictly to convey the attitudes of the devotee to the holy person. Where Photius wrote positively about such transitus without canceling the material of devotion, Archbishop Theophylact likely would have followed the controversy in Constantinople over the presence in icons due to its bearing on orthodoxy within his own troubled archdiocese. The archbishop's silence regarding sculpture suggests that the materiality of the icon was not given any special significance in his effort to communicate orthodox teachings in the Bulgarian marches. Since Theophylact's commentaries on the New Testament became standard references alongside those of Chrysostom, we might ask

225 Janet Hamilton and Bernard Hamilton with Yuri Stoyanov, Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World, c. 650-c. 1450 (Manchester UP, 1998), 36-37.

226 Charles Barber, Contesting the Logic of Painting: Art and Understanding in Eleventh-Century Byzantium (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 147 ff. In this passage, the book mistakenly prints the date of the council as 1194/95, compared to the correct date given in the rest of the book.

how Byzantine patrons and artisans navigated the generally negative subject of sculpture in the biblical texts.[227]

Illuminating Christ as the Rock

Perhaps because of Paul's complex re-interpretation of the Exodus, scenes of the miraculous draft were some of the few biblical passages concerning stone widely depicted in the Byzantine period. Their depiction almost exclusively in scriptural manuscripts reflects a broader awareness of the materiality of Christian images, where images directly accompany and often reflect interpretations of the sacred texts. Due to their careful execution facing or in the margins of the text they accompany, illuminations provide concrete evidence of how Byzantine theology animated what Byzantine Christians envisioned as the real world. While the Christian Topography of Cosmas Indicopleustes represented the waters of Meribah in a way that recalls the historical division of the twelve tribes of Israel,[228] the richly illuminated Paris Gregory (BnF cod. gr. 510) portrayed the miraculous draft in the upper register of folio 226v, above the scene of Joshua stopping the sun and moon and confronting an angelic commander.[229] The illuminations of the Byzantine Octateuchs emphasize the divine gift of water for the wandering Israelites. In both the representation of Ex 17:6 and Num 20:11, the miraculous stream gushes from the rocky hillock that dominates the center of the composition in response to a youthful Moses touching it with the tip of his outstretched staff.[230] Grateful Israelites stoop to drink in the scene of Ex 17:6, and livestock flank the stream depicting Num 20:11 in accordance with

227 Ernest W. Saunders, "Theophylact of Bulgaria as Writer and Biblical Interpreter," Biblical Research 2 (1957): 31-44.

228 Cosmas Indicopleustes,Topographie chrétienne ed. and trans. Wanda Wolska-Conus Sources chrétienne 141, 159, 197 (Paris: CERF, 1968).

the text. In illuminating the latter miracle in Topkapı Sarayı gr. 20 and Smyrna Evangelical School A.1, the hand of God reaches down from a cloud in the sky, perhaps to signify God's pronouncement against Moses and Aaron for not trusting in God's holiness or to signify the demonstration of God's holiness. What all these illuminations of the middle Byzantine period highlight is the work of God in the history of the Israelites. Byzantines likely would have seem themselves in the people of Israel, but their vision of the biblical text remained rooted in past events.

It is not surprising then to find the most significant integration of biblical revelation and Christian images in the margins of psalters from the end of Iconoclasm onwards. The psalter attracted a large range of extraneous spiritual writings that demonstrate its widespread use as a focus for Byzantine Christian devotion, beginning with biblical odes and commentaries and eventually including paschal tables, prayers, and more.[231] Because illuminated Greek psalters do not survive from before Iconoclasm, there is some debate

229 Leslie Brubaker,Vision and meaning in ninth-century Byzantium : image as exegesis in the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus, Cambridge Studies in Palaeography and Codicology 6 (Cambridge UP, 1999), 193-196, 335-349. Omont links the illumination to Gregory Nazianzus' Oration 32, "About the Moderation of Debates," but Brubaker (194) claims that a decorated initial nearby links the illumination to Oration 36, "For Himself and Those Saying that He Lusts after the See of Constantinople," both in SC 318: 83ff. and 240 ff. The few surviving early Christian precedents for the Byzantine iconography of Moses striking the rock and several Israelites drinking include a gold glass from Cologne's Römisch-Germanisches Museum (beardless Moses and three Israelites), a sarcophagus in Madrid's Real Académia de la Historia (Moses flanked by Aaron and two Israelites), and a sarcophagus in Aix-en-Provence's Musée Granet. SeeThe Gold-Glass Collection of the Vatican Library ed. Guy Ferrari (Vatican City, 1959), 68-69 pl. XXXIV fig. 421 for gold glass and Josef Wilpert, I sarcofagi cristiani antici (Rome: Ponteficio instituto di archeologia cristiana, 1929) on sarcophagi: Aix-en-Provence 1: pl. LXXXXVII fig. 2 and 2: 237; Madrid 1: pl. XI fig. 1.

230 Kurt Weitzmann and Massimo Bernabò, The Byzantine Octateuchs (Princeton UP, 1999), 169 and 202-203. The scenes are not referenced in John Lowden, The Octateuchs: A Study in Byzantine Manuscript Illumination (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State UP, 1992).

231 Georgi Radomirov Parpulov, Toward a History of Byzantine Psalters 2 vols., Diss. U of Chicago, 2004. See especially section 1.3 "Uses of the Psalter," pp. 33-46.

about what might have inspired the first extant illuminated psalters.[232] The Sinope Gospels (Paris, BnF Ms. suppl. gr. 1286) [Fig. 76] (6th century) certainly integrates illuminations and versicles of the Psalms in the bottom margins of several text pages, where a single column of large uncial script covers nearly the full page in spite of any illuminations.[233] Although the Rossano Gospels (Rossano, Museo Diocesano d'Arte Sacra) are mentioned sometimes as an example of such integration, all the illuminations for the four Gospels are gathered in the front of the first volume in the order of the events' Hagiopolitan liturgical commemoration during Holy Week.[234] They do not confront the text but illuminate it with large narrative tableaux that dominate the upper part of the page, while figures of Old Testament Prophets holding versicles from their respective books point up to the New Testament event from the lower part of the page. These earlier experiments notwithstanding, the ninth-century marginal psalters remain practically the beginning of the illuminated Byzantine psalter as it is available to scholarship.

Following the Iconoclastic debates over the historicity and legibility of saintly

232 Anthony Cutler neatly summarized the problem and pointed to the scanty evidence for a pre-Iconoclastic tradition as preserved in a miniature of the bilingual Verona Psalter, "The Byzantine Psalter Before and After Iconoclasm," Iconoclasm: Papers Given at the Ninth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham, March 1975 (University of Birmingham, 1977), 94-95. Jonathan C. Anderson has argued that Paris BN gr. 20, which he dates to the late eighth or early ninth century, could be the model of the Khludov Psalter in "Further Prolegomena to a Study of the Pantokrator Psalter: An Unpublished Miniature, Some Restored Losses, and Observations on the Relationship with the Chludov Psalter and Paris Fragement," DOP 52 (1998): 317-20. Compare Suzy Dufrenne, "L'image dans les psautiers byzantins à illustrations intégrales," The Illuminated Psalter ed. F. O. Büttner (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), 157-163, who continues to argue for a pre-Iconoclastic tradition of psalter illumination for which evidence no longer survives.

233 André Grabar, Les peintures de l'évangéliaire de Sinope (Paris, 1948); Gregory Whittington, "Notes on an Early Cycle of New Testament Illustrations: The Codex Sinopensis," Marsyas 22 (1983/1985): 1-7; and Petra Sevrugian, Der Rossano-Codex und die Sinope-Fragmente: Miniaturen und Theologie (Worms: Wernersche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1990).

234 William Loerke, "The Rossano Gospels: The Miniatures," Codex purpureus Rossanensis: Museo dell'Arcivescovado, Rossano calabro (Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1987), 121-39.

portraits, Byzantine manuscript illumination adopted the representation of icons, both in the clipeus and square formats, as signs of authenticity. Byzantine marginal psalters employ the trope of icons, among other ways, to demonstrate the typological connection of Christ with the streaming rock at Meribah and the stone not cut by human hands of Nebuchadnezzar's dream (Dan 2:34, 44). In the illumination of Psalm 80:17, "And he fed them from fat of wheat; and satisfied them with honey from rock,"[235] the Khludov Psalter (Moscow, State Historical Museum D.129 fol. 82r) portrays Christ sitting on top of the rock that Moses strikes [Fig.77]. Bearing the legend, O XC, the figure of Christ illuminates the account of Exodus 17:6, where God claims to have stood on the rock in advance of Moses' miracle. Here Christ raises his hand to bless the three Israelites who drink the miraculous draft, as both the miracle's agent and the living water that sustains Israel. In both the Khludov and Pantokrator Psalters, the legend explicitly states that "the rock is Christ," as St. Paul explained to the Corinthians (1Cor10:4).

In place of Christ atop the rock though, the Pantokrator Psalter represents Christ next to the same verse with a gold medallion of just his face [Fig. 78] which, in its circular format framed by white dots, represents the portrayals of icons in the marginal psalters. A miniature from the Khludov Psalter (Moscow, State Historical Museum D.129 fol.23v and fol.67r) shows iconoclasts destroying similar icons of Christ with whitewash at the foot of the page, while Patriarch Nikephoros watches above, holding a similar icon of Christ's face.[236] The representation of icons throughout the marginal psalters, particularly the so-

235 Although translations generally are taken from the King James Bible, I have emended this phrase to more literally reflect the Greek of the Septuagint.

236 Kathleen Corrigan, Visual Polemics in the Ninth-Century Byzantine Psalters (Cambridge UP, 1992), fig. 43.

called Holy Face of Christ (mandylion), authenticates the divine image by linking it to the recent Iconophile movement and the dogmas of II Nicea.[237] As the archetype of the human being and the reflection of God the Father, Christ's person – and by extension, his image – served as the theoretical foundation of Byzantine sacred images.[238] Moreover, the iconography of Christ's face emerged from the seventh century charged with the increasing theological and cultural significance of miraculous images not made by human hands (acheiropoietos). These images invoke legends of an historical image of Christ painted from life or left on a towel as a miraculous impression, a tradition known since Eusebius of Caesarea but only attached to cult images in the late sixth century.[239] In the increasing polarization of Christians, Jews and Muslims in the seventh century Levant, the historical connection of Christ with such images served as a bulwark against criticisms of image veneration.[240]

Again in the eleventh century, the Theodore (London, British Library Add. Ms. 19352 fol. 110r) Psalter follows the Khludov Psalter in depicting Christ sitting on the rock of Mt. Choreb for Psalm 80:17. It seems to have used an illuminated psalter like the Khludov Psalter as a fund of images, although the later psalter omitted many of the

237 Ibid., 91.

238 Herbert L. Kessler, "'Pictures Fertile with Truth': How Christians Managed to Make Images of God without Violating the Second Commandment," The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery 49-50 (1991-92): 62-64 and "Configuring the Invisible by Copying the Holy Face," The Holy Face and the Paradox of Representation ed. Herbert L. Kessler and Gerhard Wolf (Bologna: Nuova Alfa), 145-151; Gerhard Wolf, Schleier und Spiegel: Traditionen des Christusbildes und die Bildkonzepte der Renaissance (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2002), 11 ff.

239 The Abgar legend was first noted by bishop of Caesarea, Eusebius, in his Church History, I.13, and retold by John of Damascus, Exposition of the Orthodox Faith, IV.16. The fundamental historical study remains Ernst von Dobschütz, Christusbilder: Untersuchungen zur christlichen Legende 3 vols. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1899.

240 Sidney H. Griffith, "Images, Islam and Christian Icons: A Moment in the Christian/Muslim Encounter in Early Islamic Times," in La Syrie de Byzance a l'Islam, VII^{e}– VIII^{e} siècles (Damascus: Institut Français, 1992): 121-138.

images having to do with Iconoclasm that had motivated the ninth-century psalters.[241] It also added many images of saints, especially ecclesiastics, to the earlier layer of liturgical and Christological images.[242] Since the Theodore Psalter was made for a Studite Abbot, this re-orientation of the imagery presumably suited its devotional use of the middle eleventh century.[243] Far more striking than the appearance of Christ on Mt. Choreb in the marginal psalters is his absence in depictions of the event in the three illuminated Christian Topography manuscripts, Septuagints and in other psalms of the marginal psalters, especially Psalm 77 and 104. Most Byzantine illuminations that depict the miraculous draft of Meribah simply show Moses with a rod and Israelites drinking from the stream.

Perhaps due to his dual roles as earthly provider and divine revelator, Moses' miracles served as paradigms for Byzantine ascetics. The ninth-century St. Peter of Atroa, for example, twice provided water in the wilderness of Anatolia, as well as warning his monks against the wiles of Iconoclasm.[244] The eleventh-century life of St. Nikon of Sparta "Metanoiete" (†998) also recounts two instances when the saint struck water in a deserted part of Greece during the summer.[245] In the first case, the miracle accompanied the saint's

241 Sirarpie Der Nersessian, L'Illustration des psautiers grecs du Moyen Âge, II: Londres, Add. 19.352 (Paris: Klincksieck, 1970), 70. Jonathan C. Anderson

242 Christopher Walter, "Christological Themes: The Byzantine Marginal Psalters from the Ninth to the Eleventh Century," Revue des Études Byzantines 44 (1986): 284-87.

243 Jonathan C. Anderson, "On the Nature of the Theodore Psalter," Art Bulletin 70/4 (Dec., 1988), 550-68. Charles Barber ed., "Readings in the Theodore Psalter," in The Theodore Psalter [electronic facsimile] (Champaign, IL: U of Illinois, 2000), 17-18, follows Anderson in seeing a monastic emphasis on good versus evil in the imagery of the psalter. Barber also argues that the whole psalter provided an ideal image of the abbot at prayer in "Authority, Mimesis, and Prayer: Prolegomenon to an Abbot's Reading of the Theodore Psalter," in The Theodore Psalter [electronic facsimile] (Champaign, IL: U of Illinois, 2000).

244 La vie merveilleuse de Saint Pierre d'Atroa (*†837)* ed. trans. intro. A. A. Vitalien Laurent, 29: Subsidia Hagiographica (Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1956), 16 and 19.

245 The Life of St. Nikon trans. Denis F. Sullivan, 14: Archbishop Iakovos Library of Ecclesiastical and Historical Sources. Brookline, MA: Hellenic College, 1987, 32 (pg. 111) and 42 (pg. 146).

assumption of the monastic habit, and the narrator compares the staff to that of Moses. The second account of his traveling companions, who were suffering from heatstroke, speaks of their near-death experience and of the saint taking pity on them, much as Christ was reported to have compassion on the four thousand who followed him onto a deserted mountain in the Galilee (Matthew 15:29-39). The reaction of local inhabitants to this second water miracle was the typical Byzantine habit of an eminent lay patron erecting a chapel.[246] A durable and immovable icon, such as a relief in marble, would have made the perfect commemorative image to serve a wayside shrine such as this, much as a miracle of St. Nikon was "stamped and engraved" on a silver censer for another of the saint's miracles.[247] A marble relief of the saint with an appropriate inscription would have strengthened the status of the local monk who erected the chapel, likely a layman like the majority of Byzantine monks. The chapel also would have witnessed to Byzantine citizens in the remote province that their providential care came under a new, far-flung Israel that was seamlessly Roman and Christian.

In fact, the marble relief of the Theotokos Aniketos [Fig. 79] in the Cappella Zen of San Marco, Venice, literally draws this connection between the miraculous draft and the imperial authority through the inscription that accompanies the divine image. The icon represents the Christ child standing on his seated mother's right knee, straining to kiss her cheek, which Lasareff considered a thirteenth-century Eleousa type.[248] The inscription on

246 See Rosemary Morris, Monks and Laymen in Byzantium, 843-1118. Cambridge, 1995, for an account of church patronage. On holy springs in Byzantium, see Alice-Mary Talbot, "Epigrams of Manuel Philes on the Theotokos tes Peges and Its Art," DOP 48 (1994): 135-65, and "Pilgrimage to Healing Shrines: The Evidence of Miracle Accounts," DOP 56 (2002): 159 ff.

247 Life of St. Nikon, 67 (pg. 231).

248 Victor Lasareff, "Studies in the Iconography of the Virgin," Art Bulletin 20/1 (Mar., 1938): 38-42.

the right frame proclaims that "the water that once flowed miraculously from the rock was drawn forth by the prophet Moses' prayer. Now we owe it to the zeal of Michael. May You, O Christ, protect him along with his wife Irene."[249] In drawing attention to the icon, Demus rejects the patronage of Michael IX (1295-1320) in favor of the Despot of Epiros, Michael (1237-1271), "since the influence of this relief can already be traced in Venetian sculpture of the early fourteenth century."[250] The inscription clearly equates the icon's patronage with Moses' miracle at the waters of Meribah, but a deeper connection of this miracle for Byzantines was with the Virgin Pege, who was honored for the appearance of several miraculous springs around Constantinople. Because it was mistakenly believed to be carved from the stone which Moses struck, it was a sort of relic, like the stone brought to San Marco's baptistery from Sidon in 1126 from which Christ had purportedly preached or on which the Virgin had rested.[251] What differentiated the icon was precisely its image and what seems to be a belated inscription, squeezed into the frame of a pre-existing work to adapt it to new ends. In the final analysis though, most Byzantine commentators and artisans appear not to have associated the rock (Greek petra) of various biblical accounts with the stone (Greek lithos) of artistic production.

Envisioning Christ as the Stone not Cut by Human Hands

By contrast to the rock in the desert, the stone cut without human hands of

249 Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum, IV, p. 329-330, no. 8706. Translation by Hans Belting, Likeness and Presence, 200. See his note 50 for literary references, which indicate the icon was mounted above the church portal before the portal and the icon were incorporated in Cardinal Zen's chapel.

250 Otto Demus, The Church of San Marco in Venice: History, Architecture, Sculpture Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 6 (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks), 187-188.

251 Idem., 121. Henry Maguire, "The Aniketos Icon and the Display of Relics in the Decoration of San Marco," in San Marco, Byzantium, and the Myths of Venice ed. Henry Maguire and Robert S. Nelson (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 2010: 91-111.

Nebuchadnezzar's dream (Dan 2:31-46) arises as an unexpectedly positive antitype of the Virgin and Christ. The king's dream of a ruler statue cast in sections of gold, silver, bronze and iron that was struck by the stone which became a mountain filling the earth does not have a happy ending, and he later attempts to kill the three Hebrew youths for refusing to worship his own colossal ruler statue. The story might have once comforted Jewish readers in the throes of Hellenistic persecution over issues such as the veneration of royal statues, but it amazingly did not lead Christian interpreters to reflect on Christian images. The catena tradition for Daniel likewise focuses on the succession of kingdoms, even by the few writers who mention the image of Nebuchadnezzar.[252]

Theodoret's commentary on Daniel attempts to explicate Daniel as an Old Testament prophet within the problematics of Christian biblical canon, likely against a Jewish canon of scripture and its largely historical reading of the Old Testament.[253] In the context of Antiochene biblical interpretation, Theodoret explicates most of Nebuchadnezzar's dream in largely political/ethnic terms from the narrative thrust of the book.[254] He departs from the historical-literary meaning of the text for a rare and sustained Christological interpretation of the stone not cut by human hands, where he identifies the

252 Hippolytus; Apolinarius quoting Eusebius' lost book 25 of the Expositio Evangelica, both in Angelo Mai, Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio e Vaticanis Codicibus (Rome, 1825-38), vol. 1.

253 Theodoret of Cyrus, Commentary on Daniel trans. and intro. Robert C. Hill (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), xvii ff. Only the twelfth-century Escorial codex, Greek 552 (ω.III.19), contains a commentary on Daniel attributed to Chrysostom during the Byzantine period. See G. de Andrés, Catálogo de los Códices Griegos de la real Biblioteca de El Escorial, III (Madrid, 1965-67), 204-205. See more generally the author's Reading the Old Testament in Antioch (Leiden: Brill, 2005), esp. 123-134, and Frances Young's Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture (Cambridge UP, 1997).

254 Theodoret, Commentary on Daniel, xxvi ff. Thomas C. McCollough, "A Christianity for an Age of Crisis: Theodoret of Cyrus' Commentary on Daniel," Religious Writings and Religious Systems (1989): 166-169.

human advent of Christ as the stone quarried from the mountain of David's tribe.[255] According to Theodoret's interpretation it is the knowledge of Christ that will fill the earth and supplant even the memory of earthly kingdoms. Although Theodoret casts his interpretation along Christological lines, his explication remains fundamentally tied to the eschatological story of earthly kingdoms that was perennially popular in the Levant.[256]

Following the Arab conquests of the seventh century, the writing of Pseudo-Methodios and then the so-called Vision of Daniel became sources of western Medieval and Byzantine eschatology.[257] The authority of the Old Testament prophet lent luster to the tale of the last Roman emperor, who would lay his crown on the cross in Jerusalem and yield his spirit, paving the way for the Antichrist and then the Second Coming of Christ.[258] However, Liudprand of Cremona noted the Byzantine use of Daniel's "visions" to prophesy the fates of tenth-century emperors.[259] In updating the prophet's message to accommodate each new emperor, the Byzantines made Nebuchadnezzar's dream of four temporal kingdoms their own. When one considers that the political message of earthly rule unfolds in a hierarchy of materials, Daniel's vision of Antique statuary in precious and base metals provided a natural field for imaging spiritual interpretations of empire.

Following Iconoclasm the Khludov Psalter (fol. 64r) [Fig. 80] depicted an icon of

---

255 Theodoret, Commentary on Daniel, 51-55 (PG 81:1301-1303).

256 These include a variety of Persian apocalypses, Jewish apocalypses of the Hasmonean and Roman periods, as well as early Christian apocalypses.

257 Paul J. Alexander, The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition ed. and intro. Dorothy deF. Abrahamse (Berkeley: U of California, 1985), 52-122

258 Idem, "The Medieval Legend of the Last Roman Emperor and its Messianic Origins," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 41 (1978): 1-15.

259 Liudprand of Cremona, Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana ed. P. Chiesa, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, 156 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), 610 (39).

the Virgin and Child as the "stone not cut by human hands" in an echo of the triumph of the Iconophile order.[260] Although Psalm 67:17 refers to Mount Zion as "the mountain which God has delighted to dwell in," the illumination depicts Daniel lying in his bed witnessing the icon on the mountaintop and rocks falling from it. The falling rocks refer to Nebuchadnezzar's dream and foretell God's kingdom on earth, which here is pictured clearly as a Byzantine icon of the Theotokos with her hands on the shoulder of the Christ child. This icon envisions the pair just as they appear in late Antique scenes of the Adoration of the Magi,[261] only here they appear in a golden clipeus with pearled rim evocative of enameled and jeweled icons. While Corrigan connects this image to anti-Jewish rhetoric, and by extension Iconoclasts, the point is far more triumphalistic. The magi had come from the East, which was the seat of rival Islamic empires that had set up a mosque on Mount Zion physically juxtaposed to the Holy Sepulcher. Christ's Incarnation in Daniel's dream ultimately displaces chunks of rock that are shattered by the icon – and the Byzantine beholders may have hoped – those who bore this image in battle.

Following its prominence in the so-called Triumph of Orthodoxy (read: icons), the political reading of Nebuchadnezzar's vision from the book of Daniel no longer appeared in Byzantine art. Daniel proved more inspiring to the Byzantine faithful as an example of the virtuous Christian than as a type of Christ and experienced a revival in depictions of the lion's den on later cameos. In written sources too, he served as a pious example to the faithful of the Christlike life, but he no longer prominently addressed the nature of Christ

260 Kathleen Corrigan, Visual Polemics in the Ninth-Century Byzantine Psalters (Cambridge UP, 1992), 37-40 fig. 50.

261 On the image itself, including Early Christian medallions, see Natalia Teteriatnikov, "The 'Gift-giving' Image: the Case of the Adoration of the Magi," Visual Resources 13 3/4 (Mar. 1998), 381-391.

as his antitype. At least in the lectionary of the capital church, the reading of Daniel 2:31-45 was prescribed for the vigil of the Nativity and then only as one of eight Old Testament readings that foreshadowed the Incarnation.[262] The influential typikon of the Evergetes Monastery, which dates to around 1054, also provides lections for the Sunday of the Forefathers, including the visions of Daniel, if there is time.[263] A slightly later homilary (Greek panegyrikon) also recommended the visions of Daniel for this day.[264] The suggestive reading of I Corinthians 10:1-4 was listed for the Divine Liturgy on January 6 to honor Christ's baptism, the hymnography of which bracketed Christ's incarnation with his appearance to the world. As already mentioned, the apocalyptic visions ascribed to Daniel proved more influential in Byzantine political life than in theological reflection.

Many middle Byzantine sources, though, prescribe the reading of homilies on Daniel for the feast of St. Michael the Archangel (November 8) and on the Sunday of the Forefathers, which was in preparation for Nativity (second Sunday before Nativity or December 17). An exception is the notice of the Evergetes Monastery's typikon to read Chrysostom's homily "On Fasting and the Prophet Jonah, Daniel and the Three Youths" on the Friday before Lent begins.[265] In this sermon the preacher emphasizes mainly the example of the all too human prophet, Jonah, touching on Daniel in the lion's den only briefly at the end as a symbol of fasting. Most of these manuscripts seem to have been for

262 Juan Mateos, Le Typicon de la Grande Église 165: Orientalia Christiana Analecta (Vatican, 1962), 150.

263 Albert Ehrhard, Überlieferung und Bestand der hagiographischen und homiletischen Literature der griechischen Kirche von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1937), I:43. Dmitrievskij, 339-340.

264 Codex Laurenziana Conv. soppr. 189 (AF 2613) described briefly in Ehrhard, 180.

265 A. A. Dmitrievskij, Opisanie liturgicheskich rukopisej (Kiev, 1895 repr. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1965), 509. The Greek text is found in PG 40: 305 ff. (CPG 4333) and has been translated into English recently with a brief but scholarly introduction by Gus George Christo, St. John Chrysostom: On Repentance and Almsgiving (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1998), 56-68.

use in monasteries and place the reading of the homilies at matins (orthros),[266] although homilies for Great Feasts sometimes follow the vigil of the feast (pannychis). For the feast of St. Michael and All Angels (November 8), the influential typikon of the Evergetes Monastery prescribed reading Chrysostom's first and sixth homilies on Isaiah's heavenly vision.[267] Both homilies largely deal with the nature of the angels that Isaiah sees, in keeping with the feast they accompany, and with the problem of spiritual vision.[268] Neither homily mentions Daniel or stone.

For the feast of the Three Youths in Babylon and Daniel (December 17), most homilaries prescribed readings relating to the incident of the three Hebrew youths thrown into the furnace by King Nebuchadnezzar (Daniel 3).[269] A common choice, Chrysostom's "Oration on the Three Youths," rails against the idolatry of Nebuchadnezzar's image, but it does so in philosophical terms of the relationship between creator and creature.[270] The preacher does not lash out at imperial images of his own day, nor at contemporary images of saints. The standard menologion entry, on the other hand, calls for reading the life of St. Daniel, which simply retells the biblical tale in a condensed form.[271] While it adds the apocryphal incident of Habakkuk being sent by an angel to feed Daniel in the lion's den, the life adds nothing relating to stone. The lack of discussion surrounding the golden image of the king (Daniel 3) is more surprising, because the paraphrase does include Daniel's

266 Ehrhard, I:39.

267 The typikon of Evergetes recommends both readings. See Ehrhard, I:43 and Dmitrievskij, 340.

268 John Chrysostom, Homélies sur Ozias (In illud, Vidi Dominum) critical edition, French trans. and intro. Jean Dumortier, SC 227 (Paris: CERF, 1981).

269 See Ehrhard for homilies (I:160, 181, 185, 303, 510, 523 II:58).

270 PG 56:593 ff.

271 Ibid. II:471. For the vita see PG 115:371 ff. and BHG 485.

exposure of the priests of Bel behind what had seemed to the king like an animate statue of the serpent deity, Bel. Ehrhard notes a single exception, a 14th-century menologion, Athens Cod. 981, which calls for Chrysostom's "Treatise to Prove that No One can Harm the Man Who Does Not Injure Himself."[272] Chrysostom cites the Israelites' thirst for water in the desert as a lesson in desire for earthly things, much as he cites Daniel as a type of abstinence and refusal to bow down to false gods. Here again, patristic commentators largely ignore any links between stone and sculpture.

For all its theological associations then, the Pauline metaphor of Christ as the rock that accompanied Israel in the desert or the metaphor of the uncut stone of Daniel's prophecy served mainly as reminders of the continuity of Christian history. The challenges of the old Israel, often associated with the Jews, became the glorious mission of the new Israel, that is the Eastern Roman Christian state. Patristic commentaries, out of their own pre-occupation with asceticism, had developed the moral dimensions of eating and drinking in interpreting Israel's miraculous sustenance. Byzantine churchmen likewise remained content to read, reflect and comment on the tradition of these spiritual fathers with little evident need to allegorize scriptural texts to cosmological ends, although biblical texts themselves contained enough power to serve as magical amulets.

By contrast with written theology, a group of Byzantine illuminations that glossed scriptures and homilies in the aftermath of Iconoclasm envisioned Christ as an icon that engaged the world in terms of familiar miracles, such as the sacred spring or the miraculous image impressed in stone. The very implausibility of stone providing water or

272 Ehrhard, II:502. See critical text and French translation of Chrysostom's Lettre d'exil à Olympias et à tous les fidèles (Quod nemo laeditur) 103: Sources Chrétiennes ed. Anne-Marie Malingrey (Paris: CERF, 1964).

giving way to a delicate image may have authenticated such miracles. Unlike earthly sculptures, Daniel saw a stone that had not been cut by human hands but retained a record of the divine touch, much like the hand that wrote King Belshazzar's death sentence on the wall of the palace (Dan 5). The recurring miracles that involve stone in the Byzantine saints' lives demonstrate how stone continued to be a record of divine action in human history, with the implication that divine actions would continue to flow from the miraculous stone spring or image. Byzantine cameos offered icons that had the appearance of theophanies, even if they were crafted by all too human hands.

4 The Aesthetics of Stone

Although nearly all surviving Byzantine cameos are religious, it has been argued here that the Byzantines did not define a theology of materials per se. They certainly defined the limits of religious representation and worship, but scholars have tended to confuse theories of art production with theories of artistic beauty, that is aesthetics. By employing the Kantian term of modern philosophical discourse, I do not mean to imply that Byzantine beholders thought of beauty as separate from theology or science or from any other field of thought. They understood the arts and crafts through their rhetorical education, Aristotelian sciences of the day and general theological notions of history and the world. Following that complex mix of Antique sources, they praise abstract virtues, such as harmony. Modern scholarship consequently has mined Byzantine aesthetic language in terms of concepts, such as pallor (ochrotes), brightness (leukos) or variety (poikilia). While the Byzantine sources describe aesthetic and spiritual virtues in such terms, the metaphors they construct often obscure the link between the concept and the experience in Byzantine society that they are meant to evoke. The trope of the garden as both an earthly and spiritual reality ultimately grounds many of these concepts in discernible trends of Byzantine art.

Materials: Steatite, Gemstones and Metal

The classic material for Byzantine cameos is gemstones. The small number of metal icons and womb amulets from the Byzantine period does not form the same coherent corpus of subjects and formats as stone cameos. The varying formats of the

several hundred steatite icons are more ambiguous, although Kalavrezou reasonably conjectures that small square plaques were inserted into frames of larger icons, based on the few surviving examples.[273] Small square plaques could have been mounted as pendants just as easily as gemstones, but the small number of surviving steatite icons with hangers or holes suggests that this was not the case in Byzantine lands as it was in Russia.[274] Only a few steatites seem to have been purposely carved as pendants, while most small plaques probably were mounted in wooden frames. This flexibility of reuse may well have made stone icons more appealing than metal ones over several generations of owners.

An important indication of how Byzantine cameos might have been perceived and used lies in the contemporary corpus of stone enkolpia. Scholars feel certain that they were personal pendants, because an eyelet is carved into the typically square or gabled representation of Christ, the Theotokos or other saints in relief. They sometimes have inscriptions carved into the back that call on the holy person for help, much like cameos. They also have been found in archaeological sites from the turn of the millennium onwards. The popularity and distinctive style of these pendants preserved in Russia in the native stone suggest that they were a widespread phenomenon, likely even a humble imitation of Byzantine cameos.

The first datable enkolpion comes from a family burial vault in Byzantine Corinth that dates to around the second half of the eleventh century [Fig. 81].[275] Although the grave from which it came did not contain datable material, the vault attached to a tenth-

273 Ioli Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, Byzantine Icons in Steatite (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1985), 65-67.

274 #706-710 & 714 in Everyday Life in Byzantium, 516 ff.

275 Charles H. Morgan, II, "Excavations at Corinth, 1935-1936," American Journal of Archaeology 40/4 (1936): 474.

century church contained goods consistent with a date in the later eleventh or earlier twelfth century.[276] The steatite pendant includes a recessed eyelet carved into the slightly rounded top and a Greek inscription to the Lord to help the monk, Matthew.[277] The very schematized style and crude, angular cutting demonstrate how simple it was to make steatite enkolpia. The nearly rectangular shape and the raised border, without much blank ground between it and the figure of Christ Pantokrator, recall the tiny square steatite icons that were fitted into icon frames from this period onwards.[278] Where bloodstones would need to be enclosed in metal to wear on one's person, the softer steatite enkolpia usually have eyelets carved on top and bear the chips and wear of use. Some of these enkolpia have arches cut into them that recall the plaster or stone proskynetaria that framed mosaic icons in many middle Byzantine churches.[279]

A small stone icon of Ss. Peter and Paul found in Novgorod shows the same schematic style as the Corinthian pendant, although not as crudely cut, at the same time in the Russian lands [Fig. 82].[280] The scant remains of a metal bracket on top of it suggest that it too was once a pendant, although when it became a pendant is unclear. A small

---

276 #2108, Gladys R. Davidson, "The Minor Objects," Corinth 12 (1952), 261. The stratigraphy of layers before the late eleventh century has been revised by Guy D. R. Sanders, "Recent Developments in the Chronology of Byzantine Corinth," Corinth 20: Corinth, The Centenary: 1896-1996 (2003): 394. The coin dating of the burial vault does not involve pottery and so should not affect the dating of this enkolpion.

277 #706, "Steatite enkopion-amulet,"in Everyday Life in Byzantium ed. Demetra Papanikola-Bakirtzi (Athens: Kapon, 2002), 516.

278 Ioli Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, Byzantine Icons in Steatite, 27-31.

279 Sophia Kalopissi-Verti, "The Proskynetaria of the Templon and Narthex: Form, Imagery, Spatial Connections, andReception," Thresholds of the Sacred: Architectural, Art Historical, Liturgical, and Theological Perspectives on Religious Screans, East and West (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 2006): 107-132.

280 #72, "The Apostles Peter and Paul," in Sacred Arts and City Life: The Glory of Medieval Novgorod ed. Yevgenia Petrova (St. St. Petersburg: Palace Editions, 2005), 116

icon of the Russian martyr, St. Gleb (†1078), usually is dated to the reign of Tmutarakan from 1067-1068.[281] Another Russian pendant [Fig. 83] is double-sided, showing St. Demetrios seated on one side and the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus in various poses of sleep on the reverse. The iconography of Demetrios enthroned, drawing his sword supposedly came to Russia in a Byzantine icon ordered by Prince Vsevolod III (baptized Demetrios) for his patron's cathedral of St. Dmitrii in Vladimir, completed around 1197.[282] The type was reported to have been depicted in the saint's tomb in Thessaloniki in the twelfth century.[283] Given Russian contacts with Constantinople at this time, it also is unsurprising to find a handful of contemporary stone enkolpia in Russia that depict the myrrh-bearing women and St. Peter coming to the empty tomb of Christ. They follow the popularity of the motif in glass cameos of the period. Since the Russian and glass depictions of St. Demetrios are the first surviving examples of that iconography, the Russian pendant demonstrates how quickly Constantinopolitan trends could travel abroad. The pendant of Gleb likewise underlines the importance of the Corinthian enkolpion as part of a larger Byzantine phenomenon: the rise of cameos in steatite, as well as gemstones, across a wide range of social strata about the middle of the eleventh century. While some of these objects were incorporated into the traditional genre of the locket reliquary, most of them signal the separation of the icon from the reliquary. We never will know exactly how the Byzantine

281 T. V. Nikolaeva, Drevneruskaia melkaia plastika, XI-XVI [Old Russian Minor Sculpture, 11th–16th c.] (Moscow: Sovetskii Khudozhnik, 1968), 9. #5 in Boris A. Rybakov, Russkie datirovannye nadpisi XI-XIV [Dated Russian Epigraphs 11th–14th c.] (Moscow: Nauk, 1964), 16-18.

282 O. E. Etingof, Vizantiiskie ikony VI-pervoi poloviny XIII veka v Rossii [Byzantine Icons of the 6th to the first half of the 13th c. in Russia] (Moscow: Indrik, 2005), 199-200. Henry Maguire, "Observations on the icons of the west façade of San Marco, Venice," in Byzantine Icons: Art, Technique and Technology (Heraklion: Crete UP, 2002), 305-308.

283 Etingof, ibid. The reconstruction of André Grabar, "Quelques reliquaires de Saint Démétrios et le martyrium du saint à Salonique," DOP 5 (1950): 26-28, does not account for the enthroned iconography nor does it rule it out, as Etingof argues.

cameos were used, as nearly all of them have been ripped from their original mounts. However, even where small steatites, cameos or enamels are preserved with space for relics, their manufacture as icons seems to have made them self-sufficient objects for adornment, prayer, and perhaps, protection.

By contrast with the hundreds of icons in marble (55 in Lange), steatite (174 in Kalavrezou-Maxeiner) and gemstones (160 cataloged here), Bissera Pentcheva has argued that the small number of metal relief icons (2 in San Marco, excluding Georgian works) were the most cherished icons of the Byzantine period.[284] Because glyptic was such a prominent medium for magical and imperial images in Antiquity, Byzantine gems presumably would have provided as much ideological potency as enamels in the middle Byzantine period and hundreds of them survive compared to tens of enamels. Particularly for personal jewelry of a relatively compact size, enamels would have been a durable option in pendants, but I know of only one small square icon in repoussé, an enkolpion of the cross [Fig. 84].[285] On the front panel, the golden figure of the Theotokos Hagiosoritissa stands against a gold ground with only the blue accents of the suppedaneum, nimbus and cloud of God's hand to relieve the glow that surrounds her. Perhaps more interesting is the ornamental cross chased on the back panel between cypress trees. The green hatching of the Cross and trees echoes the enduring symbol of the Lifegiving Cross in Byzantium since early Byzantine times. Here again the metaphor of the garden serves as the site where the Byzantines imagine the meeting of heaven and earth. If

284 Bissera V. Pentcheva, The Sensual Icon: Space, Ritual, and the Senses in Byzantium (College Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 2010), 97-102.

285 #226 in Glory of Byzantium, 332-33. The color looks greenish in this catalog. For a larger, bluish illustration see #704 in Everyday life in Byzantium.

enamel relief icons really captured the imagination of Byzantines, why were so few made or have we really lost scores of them?

After all, it is difficult to see how cameos could have competed with the flashy poikilia of enamels or the plastic drama of ivories.[286] As Carolyn Connor has shown, many Byzantine ivories also received various amounts of gilding and polychromy.[287] An ivory usually received gilding and/or one color on its background. More coloristic effects were rare. While Cutler is right to point to later polychromy by Western owners, Byzantine enamels particularly demonstrate that polychromy was not foreign to the Byzantine aesthetic generally.[288] In Byzantine ivories human figures retained the natural sallow color and waxy texture of the tusk from which they were carved, sometimes yellower or browner with age. The sky might be painted blue or the ground green, but figures tended to remain "natural," in the sense that they retained the look and feel of the substance largely as it was taken from the natural world with only cutting and polishing. Even metals were only concentrated and melded in the fire. Enamels therefore would have been an exceptional material made of disparate chemicals that were assembled and fused through careful expertise into something unrecognizably new compared to its elements.

Aged ivory and steatite figures might fall within that range of light-green to golden color that the Byzantines described as chlorotes and applied to substances such as honey and olive oil and gold. Although the word sometimes was translated as pallor in the past, it literally signals the color that modern English-speakers denote as chartreuse. The most

286 Anthony Cutler, The Hand of the Master (Princeton UP, 1994), 110-19.

287 Carolyn O'Connor, The Color of Ivory: Polychromy on Byzantine Ivories (Princeton UP, 1998).

288 Anthony Cutler review of The Color of Ivory: Polychromy on Byzantine Ivories, by Carolyn O'Connor, CAA.Reviews, September 30, 1998, http://search.proquest.com/docview/89152531?accountid=11752.

recent version of the Liddell-Scott Greek lexicon notes in the most recent supplement that Plutarch described it as the color of gold mixed with silver (electrum). The lexicon now advises the reader to delete the section that once associated it with pallor.[289] Another close English translation might be sallowness, which would describe a more yellowish-greenish complexion often associated with physical weakness. The dictionary retains the traditional metaphorical meaning of the word as verdure, that is fresh, living or unripe vegetation, as opposed to dry and therefore dead plants. A fair, radiant complexion was important to Byzantine writers,[290] which seems to have translated in much Byzantine sculpture and metalwork to a sallow or golden shade of white.

By comparison with those media, the preponderance of cameos were carved from rather dull, opaque gemstones ranging from a yellowish-green (chloros) to a deep bluish-green (prasinos): prase, bloodstone and serpentine, as well as a few late translucent examples in jadeite. Compared to ivories or marble icons, the gemstone cameos are surprisingly dull under a range of lighting. If Liz James were correct that the Byzantine aesthetic perceived the world generally in terms of tonality, then one would expect Byzantine cameos preponderantly in light and dark sardonyx or in white or black stones.[291] Furthermore, Byzantine cameos offer relatively little color or gleaming effects to attract the eye (poikilia). Large relief icons were generally sculpted from unpainted and ungilded white marble, but they form a corpus an order of magnitude rarer than cameos and steatites combined. Two ninth-century ivories at the Victoria & Albert Museum seem to

289 Χλωρότης in A Greek-English Lexicon ed. Liddell and Scott with suppl. (Oxford, 1996), suppl. 314.

290 Liz James, Light and Colour in Byzantine Art (Oxford UP, 1996), 82.

291 Ibid., 77-80.

have been stained green like steatite, although the coloring possibly came through later burial and not a Byzantine craftsman's work.[292] They suggest an overlap in the use of ivory and steatite in the ninth or tenth century, as craftsman were deciding the appropriate formats and uses of the materials following Iconoclasm. If we consider the small squares or pendants in greenish steatite along with cameos, the distribution of possible pendants is overwhelmingly in solid green stone. Although a significant minority of steatite plaques are off-white to brownish/black, the few dark on light cameos - [Cat. 89, Fig. 55], [Cat. 91, Fig. 40], [Cat. 108, Fig. 64], [Cat. 114], [Cat. 136], [Cat. 151, Fig. 53] and [Cat. 156] - are late Western pastiches on Roman sardonyx cameos. The one indisputably Byzantine sardonyx cameo [Cat. 83, Fig. 25] employs multiple tones of white and brown against a predominantly dark background. In addition, except for two pendants in lapis lazuli with gilding [Cat. 9 and Cat. 18], I know of no other Byzantine cameos with polychromy. In surveying the hundreds of pieces of Byzantine sculpture, what is conspicuous is how few effects of color or light they offer. In Byzantium stones seem to have been valued in and of themselves as materials.

The choice of these particular gemstones is particularly odd, because the transparent gems not only were prized as beautiful in Roman times but they are particularly hard stones. They would be particularly useful in cutting metal and other gems. In fact, the rubies and emeralds that were imported from India to Rome in Antiquity continued as fictive gems in the gold borders of mosaics and revetments until the end of the Byzantine empire. Sardonyx too was a rare import that had been used for

292 Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, Byzantine Icons in Steatite, 32. #11-12 in Paul Williamson ed., Medieval Ivory Carvings: Early Christian to Romanesque (London: V&A, 2010), 64-67.

imperial portraits since the Hellenistic age, but bloodstone and serpentine are relatively common stones that would have been well within ancient abilities to work, so their popularity is puzzling. The clue to the popularity of greenish gemstones for Byzantine cameos may lie in the enameled icon of the Archangel Michael the General in San Marco, Venice [Fig. 32] that imagines the warrior saint standing in front of an arcade within a garden. Where Pentcheva argues that the phenomenal effects that constituted poikilia dominated esthetic decisions, I argue that the trope of the garden structured ambitious Byzantine arts from the middle of the eleventh century on.

Texts on Middle Byzantine Stones

The learned patriarch of Constantinople, Photius, highlighted the marble façade of the imperial Pharos chapel around 864.[293] The gleaming marbles of the atrium supposedly stunned visitors, before they even could peek inside the church proper. In praising the nearly seamless joinery of the revetment, his aesthetic clearly admired the workmanship of admittedly luxurious materials. His highest praise was that the artisans had crafted the exterior as "of a single [piece of] stone." As with Byzantine cameos or ivories or marble reliefs, the integrity of rare materials is some of what is at stake for Byzantine aesthetics.

Along with white marble relief icons; ivories, steatites and cameos raise the possibility that Byzantines appreciated the subdued pallor of monochromatic arts for their spiritual associations.[294] The ekphrasis of Leo VI (886-912) on the church in the monastery of Kauleas at Constantinople speaks of the "pallor of gold" as suitable to its

293 Cyril Mango, Homilies of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1958), 185-86.

294 Maguire, Nectar and Illusion, 129.

members. It has been translated by Cyril Mango as follows:

> It [the church] is paved with white slabs [which form] a continuous translucent [surface], uninterrupted by any other color: the craftsman has preferred this pure splendor to a variegated composition such as is often to be seen in pavements. However, a boundary, as it were, made of a stone of a different color, surrounds the white translucence, pleasing as it is, even more agreeable....Now the [structure] which is above the beautiful pavement and forms the roof is raised in the shape of a half-sphere. In the midst of it is represented an image of Him to whom the craftsman has dedicated the church. You might think you were beholding not a work of art, but the Overseer and Governor of the universe Himself who appeared in human form, as if He had just ceased preaching and stilled his lips. The rest of the church's hollow and the arches on which the roof is supported have images of [God's] own servants, all of them made of mosaic smeared with gold. The craftsman has made abundant use of gold whose utility he perceived: for, by its admixture, he intended to endow the pictures with such beauty as appears in the apparel of the emperor's entourage. Furthermore, he realized that **the pallor of gold** [emphasis mine] was an appropriate color to express the virtue of [Christ's] members. Along with them is represented in a certain place the virgin Mother holding the infant in her arms and gazing upon Him with a mixture of maidenly composure and motherly love: you can almost see her opening her lips and addressing motherly words to the child, for to such an extent are the images endowed with life. The remainder of the church, i.e., as much as is not covered with holy figures, is adorned with slabs of many colors. These have a beauty that corresponds exactly to that of the rest of the edifice.[295]

It is unclear in the text whether the "pallor of gold" is said to be appropriate for the depiction of the saints, or of the imperial retinue, or both.

Still more curious is that the emperor boasts of luxury floors made from whole slabs of colored stone, rather than pieced from many small chunks. He stresses the aesthetic advantage not of monochromy so much as amiges or unmixedness, that is without piecing. Poikilia is precisely what a craftsman would provide from skill out of a lot of spoliated fragments of expensive stone. Only an emperor presumably could afford the large expanses of uninterrupted paneling that Justinian ordered for St. Katherine's Monastery

295 Cyril Mango ed. and trans., The Art of the Byzantine Empire, 312-1453: Sources and Documents (University of Toronto, 1986), 202-203. Greek edition by Theodora Antonopoulou, Leonis VI Sapientis Imperatoris Byzantini Homiliae (Turhnout: Brepols, 2008), 425-26.

on Mt. Sinai or in Hagia Sophia. Cosmatesque pavements took great skill but did not require the imperial reach that drew the big colored stones from around the empire for a special order. It also is, perhaps, worth noting that the emperor credits the artisan for making a lot of the aesthetic decisions. Everyone was well aware that the patron provided expensive materials for a project, such as gold, but the emperor modestly credits the craftsman for making the most luxurious use of the materials, presumably according to convention. Despite the conventions of rhetoric, the imperial poet reminds us that much of what we observe in the use of stones or ivories remained conventional uses of obtainable materials within the larger tastes and ideologies of Byzantine society. Neither the patron, nor the artisan, nor the theologian felt free to choose idiosyncrasies in Byzantine art or literature.

When Constantine of Rhodes dedicated a poem to Constantine VII (945-959) on the church of the Holy Apostles, he described the doubled columns of precious stones, "each of them, like a marvelous meadow, [which] gives the impression of numberless buds of flowers."[296] The metaphor of the field had signaled the search for paradisaical life by pioneering Christian monks in late Antiquity. For example, John Moschos' famous sixth-century collection of monastic anecdotes was itself named the Spiritual Meadow. Here, though, the orator seeks to praise the taste of an urbane emperor, not unlike his Roman imperial predecessors. He even may mean to imply that this emperor, who was renowned for reviving ancient learning, had played some role in the church's design, although the actual church was constructed by Justinian. In a very abstract sense, the emperor's

296 Liz James transl. and ed., Constantine of Rhodes, On Constantinople and the Church of the Holy Apostles: With a new edition of the Greet text by Ioannis Vassis (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), vv. 694-695.

patronage also demonstrates his right to rule the Christian nation under Christ, who was prominently figured in the dome mosaic. These stones then reveal a mastery over an earthly realm that is envisioned bursting with the vitality of a spring meadow, rather than envisioning the ethereal cloudscape that constitutes the modern Western stereotype of Heaven. Although Christ returns to the clouds in the Ascension and the hand of God often reaches down from a cloud in Byzantine iconography, Byzantine art generally pictured the saints in a land of golden tesserae, ivory, white marble, green steatite or greenish gems. Paradise was radiant and colorful as a perfected vision of this world.

A generation later, John Geometres likewise would praise the flowering meadows and stones of the imperial country palace of the virtues, Aretai.[297] He might have envisioned a suburban garden like the contemporary psalter illumination [Fig. 85] of David playing his lyre in a classical garden, flanked by muses or graces, hence the name aretai.[298] The poet seems to have been a professional soldier all his life,[299] so the poem reflects the courtly culture of educated men actively engaged both in political and intellectual life. In this light, the image of the saintly warrior king beside a classical funerary pillar in a garden reflects a larger ideal of the garden as the site of personal realization. Just as the garden may have realized the balanced wisdom and action of Basil the Nothos, so it becomes the place where David is inspired to compose psalms that reflect

297 Henry Maguire, "A Description of the Aretai Palace and its Garden ," Journal of Garden History 10 (1990): 209-213. Marc D. Lauxtermann, "John Geometres – Poet and Soldier," Byzantinische Zeitschrift 68/2 (1998): 376-77, speculates that the poem commemorates the Aretai as the palace of Basil the Nothos (earlier parakoimomenos) during the regency of roughly 980-985.

298 Hugo Buchthal, The Miniatures of the Paris Psalter (London, 1938), 13-17 fig. 1. The connection to ekphrasis is explained in Henry Maguire, "Style and Ideology in Byzantine Imperial Art." Gesta 28/2 (1989): 217-220.

299 Marc D. Lauxtermann, "John Geometres – Poet and Soldier," Byzantion LXVIII (1998): 356-80.

his personal struggle to serve God and triumph over his enemies. From more mundane sources, we also know that Byzantine emperors used the hunt to impress foreigners with the imperial virtues.[300] What is significant for interpreting Byzantine art is how central the image of the garden proved to envision the church and emperor. The meadow of the Creator's grace seems now to have become a garden cultivated by enlightened human virtues for the enjoyment of human subjects in an aesthetic discourse something like taste.

Geometres also praised what seems to have been a statue of Emperor Nikephoros I (r. 802-11), which included diamond and stone along with precious metals.[301]

> On the lord Nikephoros, the emperor
>
> Do not with various colors but of diamond,
> gold, silver, stone, bronze as well as iron
> assemble a vision of the despot,
> the body of a form. Firstly mold
> a golden heart, but breasts of shining silver,
> and hands of bronze and let him be strong of arms,
> the waist of diamond, the feet from stone,

300 Henry Maguire, "Imperial gardens and the rhetoric of renewal," New Constantines: the rhythm of imperial renewal in Byzantium, 4th-13th centuries (Brookfield, VT: Variorum, 1994) 187-93.

301 J. A. Cramer, Anecdota graeca e codd. Manuscriptis bibliothecae regiae parisiensis (Oxford, 1841), 266. This poem likely was written early in his literary career, during the reign of Nikephoros II (r. 963-9), in order to praise that autocrat by association with the earlier ruler of the same name.

> Εἰς τὸν κύριον Νικηφόρον τὸν βασιλέα
>
> Μὴ χρώμασι ποικίλλε δεσπότου θέαν,
> ἀλλ'ἀδάμαντα, χρυσὸν, ἄργυρον, λίθον,
> χαλκόν τε κὰι σίδερον, ἁρμόσας ἅμα·
> μόρφου τὸ σῶμα· καρδίαν μὲν χρυσέαν
> πρώτιστα πλάττε, στέρνα λαμπροῦ δ'ἀργύρου,
> χεῖρας δὲ χαλκοῦ καὶ σθένη βραχιόνων,
> τὴν ἰξὺν ἀδάμαντος, ἐκ λίθου πόδας,
> κνήμας δὲ καὶ τὰ νῶτα καὶ στερρὰν κάραν,
> τὸ πᾶν σιδερᾶ. Ταῦτά μοι ξενοτρόπως
> μίξας τὰ πάντα καὶ κεράσας τῇ τέχνῃ,
> ἄγαλμα καινὸν, αὐτόχυνον, ποικίλον,
> ἵστη πρὸς αὐγὰς, ἔνθα φλογμὸς ἡλίου,
> χιών τε κὰι χάλαζα καὶ κρυμοῦ βία,
> τούτοις τὸ σῶμα δεσπότου τοὐμοῦ τύπου.

but the lower legs both the calves and kneecap
all of iron. When you have joined all of them
for me in exotic fashion and mingled [them] by art,
set [it] as a new statue, realized by itself, full of variety
before the eyes, where [there is] scorching sun,
snow as well as hail and violent freezing,
with these mold the body of my despot.

His hierarchy of materials lists diamond first, then gold and silver before stone, and finally bronze and iron. In the case of the learned poet, diamond here evidently finds its power in its hardness, which could cut all other materials. Its transparency seems hardly relevant to the poet. The durable materials and fine workmanship are meant to give the imperial figure a sense of timelessness in the face of the harsh elements. The image of an imperial statue standing up to the elements is all the more poignant, because the assemblage of materials is reminiscent of the dream of Daniel. In the biblical tale, the prophet foretold the king's downfall and that of successive, increasingly fragile kingdoms through the ever more fragile materials that composed the lower regions of the king's idol. Here in the Byzantine construction of the emperor's statue though, the assembly of various noble materials foretells durability rather than decline. Its constructive, indeed modular, aesthetic is similar to the actual Byzantine goldsmithing that we find, assembled from metals, enamels and studded with pearls or gems. This aesthetic also may account for the emphasis on cameos as single-figure works from largely monochromatic stones, which were designed to preserve the integrity of the figure within a large piece of jewelry.

In another poem on a glass (huelinon) angel or annunciation or even a vessel of some kind, he juxtaposes visible sunlight from glass with the reflections of divine intellects

(hoi theoi noes), which ultimately are "flames of fire [cf. Ps 103:4, quoted in Heb 1:7]."[302]

On a Glass Communication

From glass [comes] light of the visible lightbringer,
but the divine intellects pour down reflections of the divinely working light.
Glasses [are] mirrors of the sun's light,
but the divine intellects of the sun's Creator.
You are formed of crimson gleaming glass,
like mirrors of the light, flames of fire.

Although the title is singular, the highly allusive verses vaguely follow Neoplatonic and Dionysian motifs of minds that are themselves the product of a divine artisan (tou theourgou) and of a creator (tou ktisantos). Following comparisons of these intellects with mirrors, the statement that they are formed from crimson gleaming glass (ex foinikes morphousthe leukes huelou) seems strange as an allusion to cameos, because almost no middle Byzantine cameos are made of red stone and certainly not transparent ones. It is not even certain from the tangled series of genitives whether the angelic beings are figured on an object, like a cameo, or even a piece of stained glass.[303] The ambiguous wording of Geometres' poem admits these reflections to be formed from crimson white glass or from bright crimson glass. The scriptural reference makes it most likely that he is writing of a Christian reality, angels, in classicizing language in a manner common for the times.

302 Ibid., 301. The title is completely defective. Migne's PG: 106 emendation to angelia is tempting, because it permits a reading close to annunciation. However, the contents of the poem nowhere evoke Marian imagery.

Εἰς ὕελινον ἀγγελίνη

Ἐξ ὕελου μὲν φῶς ὁρατοῦ φωσφόρου,
τοῦ δ' ἀῦ θεουργοῦ φωτὸς ἀνταναϰλάσεις
ϰάτω διαῤῥέουσιν ὁι θεῖοι νόες.
Ἔσοπτρα φωτὸς ὕελοι μὲν ἡλίου,
τοῦ δ' ἥλιον ϰτίσαντος ὁι θεῖοι νόες.
Ἐϰ φοινηϰῆς μορφοῦσθε λευϰῆς ὑέλου
τοῦ φωτὸς ὡς ἔσοπτρα, τοῦ πυρὸς φλόγες.

303 The two examples of stained glass in Byzantium remain enigmatic, as we have seen already. See pages 100-101 above.

Another tantalizing possibility is that it might be a chalice in red stone or Eucharistic wine shining through a glass or crystal chalice. Unfortunately, no examples of the latter are known from Byzantium, although later frescoes of the Last Supper offer late Medieval prunted beakers with wine in them on the table.[304] The contemporary Byzantine chalice of Romanos II (r. 959-63) [Fig. 1] in brown sardonyx helps us to envision how a glowing empty example might look.[305] Only a contemporary reference survives in the vision recounted in the Life of St. Basil the Younger, where a servant girl, Theodora, takes a near-death trip to Paradise.[306] There she observes the saints eating from precious red stone vessels in gold mounts.[307]

In contrast, John Mauropous praised the ascetic pallor of a stone icon of St. Basil the Great in a poem in the middle of the eleventh century.[308] It is a common Byzantine

304 Maria G. Parani, "Represenations of Byzantine Glass as a Source on Byzantine Glass: How Useful are They?" DOP 59 (2005): 164-170.

305 #11 in The Treasury of San Marco (Milan: Olivetti, 1984). Pentcheva, Sensual Icon, 112.

306 Pentcheva, Sensual Icon, 149-150, applies this reference to the revetment of Byzantine church interiors.

307 Vita S. Basilii Iunioris, 43, edited by A. N. Vesselovskij, "Razyskanija v oblasti russkago duhovnago stiha," Sbornik' Otdelenija russkago jazuka I slovenosti Imperatorskoj akademii nauk' 46 (1889-90): supp., 3-89.

308 #16 in Iohannis euchaitorum metropolitae quae in codice vaticano graeco 676 supersunt ed. Paul de Lagarde (Gottingen, 1882), 9.

Εἰς τὸν μέγαν Βασίλειον

Ἐπιπρέπει τις σεμνοποιὸς ὠχρότης
ἐξ ἐγκρατείας τῶ σοφῶ διδασκάλῶ.
ἀλλ' εἰ λαλήσει (ζῆν δοκεῖ γὰρ καὶ τύπος),
τρυφὴ τὸ χρῆμα, φαιδρότης καὶ τερπνότης.
Οὐκοῦν τὰ χείλη πρὸς λόγους κίνει, πάτερ,
τοὺς καὶ λίθους θέλγοντας˙ἀλλὰ μὴ λέγε
ἅπερ διδάσκων εἰς συναίσθησιν ἄγεις˙
δάκνειν γὰρ οἶδε ταῦτα, κἂν στάζῃ μέλι,
τοὺς ἕλκεσι βρύοντας˙ἐξ ὧν στυγνότης,
πρὸς ἣν ἐπαρκεῖς καὶ γραφεὶς οὕτω μόνον.

conception of saintly bishops, especially of St. Basil.[309]

On the Great Basil

Some august pallor from abstinence
is conspicuous on the wise teacher.
However, if he should speak
– for even the figure seems to live,
it would be delight, joy and pleasure.
Therefore, move your lips toward words O father,
enchanting even the stones.
But do not say the things teaching
which you guide to consciousness [of sin]
for even if they may drip with honey,
these know how to sting those who are bursting with sores,
from whom [come] sullenness,
against which you help and write thus alone.

The poet went so far as to imagine the typos as appearing alive and wondered rhetorically if the lips would not move "even the enchanting stones" of which it was made. The poem unambiguously connects the august (semnopoios) pallor, the saint's continence (egkrateia) and his attainment of wisdom as a teacher.

Around 1077 the great philosopher, Michael Psellos, provided a description of the church of St. George in the Mangana neighborhood that had been erected in the 1040's by Emperor Constantine IX.[310] He explains how the emperor had decorated the floors and walls with green stones, "and these stones, set one above another, in patterns of the same hue or in designs of alternate colours, looked like flowers." Although this was a Roman trope to describe buildings as a flowery meadow, Psellos proceeds to explain how massive lawns with flowers and fountains frame the complex within its walls so that one cannot take them all in one glance. The description of multiple buildings and complexes is that of

309 Henry Maguire, Icons of their Bodies, 79.

310 Michael Psellos, Chronographia trans. E.R.A. Sewter (New Haven: Yale UP, 1953), Constantine IX.185-87.

a huge campus designed to replace one's sense of the world with that of a perfect world. Psellos explains the aesthetic of a telescoping beauty where the whole attracts one to study the parts, which are just as beautiful. Earlier descriptions of Paul the Silentiary and Constantine the Rhodian of Hagia Sophia had stressed the disorienting multiplicity of works, but Psellos describes a harmonious vision with the potential for progressive exploration and understanding. At the end of the description, he explains that "it was as if the pilgrimage had ended, and here was the vision perfect and unparalleled." It is as if the garden of Eden or the new Jerusalem are located now at the center of Constantinople, verdant and new.

A verse of Nicholas Kallikles (fl. 1090's-1130's) on a lost marble relief of St. George in the Mangana Monastery explains how the martyr's sweat washed the ruddiness from his icon.[311]

> On a marble sign of Saint George
>
> A child of Abraham [is] this very martyr [made] from stones
> Even if some of his flesh had been turned red,
> it has become snowy, found white,
> cleansed by martyrs sweats.

The martyr has inherited eternal life by producing the fruits of repentance [Mt 3:8, Lk 3:9], namely enduring bloody torments for his witness to Christ. The periphrastic use of "to have" with the aorist passive participle juxtaposes the bloody wounds that others inflicted on the martyr with the white complexion that he has received from God. A full

311 Maguire, Icons of their Bodies, 76. The English translation is mine. The Greek is #3 in Roberto Romano ed., Nicola Callicle, Carmi (University of Naples, 1980), 80.

> In signum marmoreum Sancti Georgii.
>
> Παῖς Ἀβραὰμ ὁ μάρτυς οὗτος ἐκ λίθων·
> πλὴν ἔι τι σαρκὸς εἶχεν ἠρυθρωμένον,
> ἐχιονώθη τοῦτο, λευκὸν εὑρέθη,
> μαρτυρικοῖς ἱδρῶσιν ἐκπεπλυμένον.

exegesis of the poem reveals that red is solely the color of violence. On the other hand, the image of repentance as "whiter than snow" [Ps 50:9] is a commonplace of Byzantine liturgy found in the preparation of clergy and laity for the sacrifice of praise. Since white marble was widely used to decorate churches, the poet may have found it necessary to play off the soldier's career in explaining the icon's material. The conventional use of marble does not imply, though, that it was unsuitable for a soldier or particularly suitable for Christ and his mother. The full range of iconography was displayed in marble, just as it was in ivory or steatite. The poet's task always was to employ whatever associations he could to praise the saint. Even where red does intrude suggestively into the figure of a Byzantine cameo,[312] it is doubtful that it conveys a positive association with Christ used by the artisan. Claims also have been made that a Byzantine artisan incorporated the swirling grain of the ivory around Christ's stomach in a Byzantine icon of the Crucifixion to enhance its realism.[313] While it is tempting to see Byzantine artisans as approaching materials naturalistically, the majority of Byzantine carvings in any material fail to employ intrusions of color or grain into something that looks natural. The few exceptions prove the rule that Byzantine artisans worked traditional materials to execute traditional subjects with little regard for harmonizing them. For poets, on the other hand, it was necessary to compare the physical object and its subject in order to generate the figurative language that taught virtue or glorified the patron.

Another surprising ekphrasis of red sculpture by Constantine Manasses (fl. 1130's-60's) praises an ancient sculptural ensemble of Polyphemos eating the companions of

312 #6 in Sacred Art, Secular Context, 61 [Cat. 52].

313 Cutler, Hand of the Master, 35.

Odysseus for its violence.[314] The poet marveled at the craftsmanship that "made its basic [material] of a color matching the subjects of the carvings, in order that the stone not be engrained with spurious and alien tints, but should be bathed in blood from its core, as they say." Here the nature that was captured by the material was not the body or other physical characteristis but the inner emotion evoked by the narrative. For an educated Byzantine elite, Homer's Illiad and Odyssey were the foundational text of urbanity and also a dangerous pagan mythology. This Roman sculpture thus represented the dog-eat-dog world from which Christ had saved the Greco-Romans. What was "natural" for the Byzantine beholder was the correspondence between superficial material and inner meaning, not superficial material and physical subject. While porphyry was commonly used for Roman figural sculpture, the only Byzantine red stone carving is the jasper cameo of Daniel in the Lions Den [Cat. 85, Fig. 37]. Most Byzantine cameos were cut in the green material of bloodstone or the brown of sardonyx with no distinction between subjects. Ascetics and warriors likewise were cut mostly in these stones rather than in red or white.

Eugenios of Palermo (fl. 1150's-90's) praises St. John Chrysostom's sallow complexion as representing his holiness.[315] Maguire translates the poem as follows:

---

314 Leo Sternbach, "Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte," Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien 5 (1902) Beiblatt, cols. 83-85. A translation of part of the passage is found in Henry Maguire, "Byzantine Art History in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century," Byzantium: A World Civilization (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1992), 139-40. This must be a Roman sculptural group like that found in the grotto at Sperlonga, Italy. See A. F. Stewart, "To Entertain an Emperor: Sperlonga, Lakoon and the Emperor Tiberius at the Dinner-Table," Journal of Roman Studies 67 (1977): 76-90.

315 #11 in Marcello Gigante, Versus iambici (Palermo, 1964). Maguire, Nectar and Illusion, 130.

Καὶ χρῶμα χρυσοῦν, πάμμακαρ, σοὶ καὶ στόμα·
τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐνχέον χρυσοῦς λόγους
τὴν κλῆσιν ἀπένεγκεν ἐκ τῶν πραγμάτων,
τουδὶ τὸ σεμνὸν ὠχρότης διαγράφει·

All blessed on, both your color and your voice are golden.
For the one [your voice], pouring out to us golden words,
took its name from your deeds,
while pallor delineates the holiness of your color.
For consuming your flesh by the fire of fasting,
you have tinged it with the pallor of gold.

Ironically consuming his own flesh through fasting, the saint thereby tinges his complexion with the "verdure of gold." Because chlorotes was used of a sickly green complexion that signaled weakness or disapproval,[316] it was important for the poet to compare the saint to a noble substance with positive associations. The poet probably meant to juxtapose the negative experiences that his audience would have had of extreme fasting with its paradoxical spiritual achievement. The word chlorotes sounds very much like ochrotes, but it permits the richer play of connotations of both a sallow complexion and of lively vegetation.

Pallor certainly would be appropriate for a wide range of the most popular saints in a variety of media: Christ, the Virgin, bishops and monks – all of them celibate and renouncing violence as part of their status. Fifty five or so large marble relief icons survive from the Byzantine period (generally around 4 x 5 feet), testifying to the popularity of plain white icons that did not need the colors to attract patronage.[317] A finely carved plaque of the Theotokos Blachernitissa [Fig. 86] now in the Istanbul Archeological

---

σὴν σάρκα καὶ γὰρ πυρπολῶν ἀσιτίαις
ἔχρωσας αὐτὴν χλωρότητι χρυσίου.

316 Liz James, Light and Colour in Byzantine Art, 83-84, cites two Byzantine examples of an ochros complexion as pale in the negative sense of weak or disapproving looks.

317 Reinhold Lange, Die byzantinische Reliefikone (Recklinghausen: Aurel Bongers, 1964). Hans Belting, "Zur Skulptur aus der Zeit um 1300 in Konstantinopel," *Münchner Jahrbuch der Bildenen Kunst* 23 (1972): 65, argued that they were expedients for wet environments. However, only a few have been found with holes for piping and mosaic was as traditional choice for outdoor environments.

Museum provides a sense of how such pallor might have looked to Byzantine beholders.[318] Ivory icons presumably offered the same benefits of pallor, although they often were gilded and were colored from time to time. Although gilding suggests a natural association of gold with light and pallor in Byzantine aesthetics, the relative rarity of gilding on ivories, marble reliefs, steatites and cameos ultimately indicates a Byzantine preference for the integrity or purity of the image/impression in its material substrate. While the Byzantines often mention a poikilia of various materials, what has survived in large quantity from the ninth through twelfth centuries are dull, opaque cameos of Christ and the saints. Their integrity as single images would have evoked the ideal of unadulterated perfection, even as they would have been set in gleaming golden mounts adorned with pearls and lighter gems.

By contrast with spiritual pallor, an epigram from the reign of Emperor Manuel Komnenos (r. 1143-1180) lauds a stone sculpture of Christ's Baptism in the allegorical terms of the garden.[319] Because it reveals how the Christian commonplace of the garden became fused with imperial identity and art, it deserves full quotation and analysis.

> "On the icon of the Baptism of the Christ decorated by our mighty and holy emperor set up when the patriarch does the prayers of the Lights [that is, blessing of waters on Theophany] in the palace." 14 lines.
>
> Beg. If some river of coal bursts into flame.
>
> End. But the scarlet-blooming autocrat, Manuel, tinges the impression with chartreuse of gold, whose might would that you establish, stone Christ, while the budding of enemies like a shoot of the field would that you burn up with strikes of mystical fiery coals.[320]

318 #1 in Lange, Die byzantinische Reliefikone, 43.

319 #39 (fol. 18a) in Spyridonos Lambros ed. "O Markianos Kodix 524," Neos Hellenomnemon 8/1 (1911): 16.

320 «Εἰς εἰκονα τῆς βαπτίσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ προτιθεμένην ὅτε ὁ πατριάρχης ἐν παλατίῳ ποιεῖται τὰς τῶν Φώτων εὐχὰς, κοσμηθεῖσαν παρὰ τοῦ κραταιοῦ καὶ ἁγίου ἡμων βασιλέως». Στίχοι 14.

First, the poem is addressed to a stone Christ, lithe rather than lithine "stony". Since the imperial scarlet touches the surface of the icon to impress gold, the imperial patron may well have paid for costly inlaid gold to highlight a bas relief. While chartreuse (chloroteti) often is used to refer to the color of olive oil, honey or gold, its reference to pale green shoots may here refer to underlying steatite or another relatively bright, pale green stone. Small steatite icons of the great feasts of Christ and Mary became common in the middle Byzantine period, some of which are gilded.[321]

In linking steatite to its green color, Kalavrezou noted only a single poem that mentioned color, referring to a green steatite icon in terms of a plant or stem, phuton.[322] She hypothesized that only the green variety was monochromatic enough to earn the epithet "spotless" compared to white and brown steatites.[323] The original version of the poem was dedicated to Alexios III Komnenos Angelos (1195-1203) and carved on a dull green steatite bowl for ceremonial bread, a panagiarion, now in the monastery of St. Panteleimon on Mt. Athos [Fig. 87].[324]

Ἄρχ. Εἴ τις ποταμὸς ἄνθρακος φλόγα βρύει.
Τέλ. Χρώζει δὲ χλωρότητι χρυσοῦ τὸν τύπον
ὁ πορφυρανθὴς Μανοθὴλ αὐτοκράτωρ,
οὗ, λίθε Χριστὲ, τὸ κράτος μὲν ἑδράσαις,
ἐχθρῶν δὲ τὴν βλάστησιν ὡς ἀγροῦ χλόην
βολαῖς φλογίσαις μυστικῶν πυρανθράκων.

321 Ioli Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, Byzantine Icons in Steatite, 73 ff.

322 #220 in Miller ed., Manuelis Philae Carmina 1, 431. I have transcribed the poem in note 322 below from Piatnitsky's photograph.

323 Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, Byzantine Steatite, 83. Cf. # in Everyday Life in Byzantium for a clear white steatite pendant.

324 Yuri Piatnitsky, "The Panagiarion of Alexios Komnenos Angelos and Middle Byzantine Painting," Perceptions of Byzantium and Its Neighbors (843-1261) ed. Olenka Z. Pevny (New York: Metropolitan Museum, 2000), 43-45.

Inscription around the inner roundel:
†ΑΝΑΝΔΡΕΜΗΤΕΡΠΑΡΘΕΝΕΩΡΕΦΟΤΡΟΦΕ∗ΚΟΜΝΗΝΟΝΑΛΕΞΙΟΝΑ ΓΕΛΟΝΣΚΕΠΟΙC

Inscription around inner roundel:
Husbandless Mother, Infant-nourishing Virgin/protect Komnenos Alexios Angelos.

Inscription around outer rim:
The meadow and the plants and the light with three rays./The stone is a meadow and the row of prophets are the plants./The three beams are Christ, the bread and the Virgin./The maiden lends flesh to the word of God,/and Christ by means of bread distributes salvation/to Komnenos Angelos and strength to Alexios.

The setting of the green stone in the metaphor of the garden confirms the growing notion in Byzantium of the garden as the site of intellectual and aesthetic communion, where the highest human inspiration received divine thoughts. Furthermore, the ranking of two orders of vegetation, the garden and its plants, suggests that the cypress trees or flowers next to a cross are meant to represent the faithful around Christ in a dynamic interchange of signs. Spiritually restored human life is the garden of Eden, a meadow where the saints ever blossom with new insights and teachings, like the prophets of this bowl who hold scrolls with their sayings. In conclusion, the survey of Byzantine texts finds two recurring motifs that poets employ to play on the materiality of icons: pallor (ochrotes) and greenish sallowness (chlorotes) heighten the spiritual remove of sacred figures, while the more varied and colorful imagery of the garden emphasizes spiritual engagement with the world.

Texts on Late Byzantine Stones

As the analysis of cameos makes clear, the fall of Constantinople to crusaders in 1204 was a watershed that changed the distribution of Byzantine cameos and led to their

---

Inscription around outer rim:
+ΛΕΙΜΩΝΦVΤΑΤΕΚΑΙΤΡΙCΑΚΤΙΝΟΝCΕΛΑCΛΕΙΜΩΝΟΛΙΘΟCΦVΤΑΚΗΡVΚΩΝΦΑΛΑƵΤ
ΡΙΑΤΡΙCΑVΓΙΗΧC̄ΑΡΤΟCΠΑΡΘΕΝΟCΚΟΡΗΔΑΝΖΕΙCΑΡΚΑΤΩΘV̄ΛΟΓΩΑΡΤΩΔΟΧC̄ΠΡΟ
CΝΕΜΕΙCΡΙΑΝΚΟΜΝΕΝΑΓΓΕΛΩΚΑΙΡΩCΙΝΑΛΕƵΙΩ

widespread imitation. The stone pendants that begin in Russia give scholars at least one reason to suppose that the chalcedony and sapphire cameos found there in the fourteenth century are local products. Likewise, we have reviewed documents that indicate a booming lapidary industry already in thirteenth-century Italy and France and in Bohemia by no later than a century after that. At this point of research, the later cameos that display stylistic continuity with Byzantine examples from the turn of the thirteenth century also show a clear trend toward an expanded range of stones.

Along with the increased use of chalcedony and sapphire, one finds Byzantine cameos again cut in other transparent stones for the first time since Antiquity. A rock crystal cameo of Christ Pantokrator in the Benaki Museum, Athens [Cat. 112], is at the center of a sixteenth-century gilded and jeweled enkolpion, cut in a schematic style not seen since Iconoclasm and only like the Pantokrator in [Cat. 121, Fig. 65]. The Troitse-Sergieva Lavra also has a number of transparent gems: [Cat. 111, Fig. 61], [Cat. 127, Fig. 66], [Cat. 140, Fig. 34] and [Cat. 154, Fig. 59]. In terms of subject and composition, these new transparent cameos all are relatively conservative examples of common subjects in middle Byzantine cameos, which makes them recognizable as cameos in the Byzantine tradition. Many of them follow the quick, angular strokes found in the cameo of Alexios V Doukas [Cat. 102, Fig. 22-23], which I take to be cut in the Balkans for a Byzantine audience. The more rounded and elongated features in the cameos preserved in Russia stylistically follow examples found today in the Museumslandschaft Hesse in Kassel, Germany, and probably represent the efforts of Russian craftsmen to adapt to the extremely hard stones they were first able to obtain after 1204. If these new trends were

simply an aesthetic move towards more monochromatic stones then one could expand the discussion of pallor.[325] However, the use of colored transparent stones and variegated stones includes Christ, the Virgin, the archangel Michael and the prophet Daniel. In the art and literature of this period, Michael is the warrior par excellence, while Christ and the Theotokos are spotless celibates. However, celibacy encompasses both embodied and bodiless powers, the human and the divine.

The dichotomy that Maguire finds between blood red and pure white in the earlier poem on St. George by Kallikles (early 12th c.) and a poem here by Manuel Philes (early 14th c.) then likely are peculiar to St. George and the rhetorical need for antithesis that is a common device in Byzantine hymnography and poetry.

> On the marble stele of the great martyr George
>
> Stone labored over for a sculpture of the one crowned
> displays the unbending strain in his labors.
> For it was not seemly for the one bearing
> the cuts deep in his flesh to be imprinted with colors.[326]

Here again the poet has juxtaposed the icon's material and the paradoxical subject. In the lives of the saints, this paradox of spiritual exaltation through worldly suffering always lies beneath the surface of the narrative as the implicit subject. The worldly defeat is what reveals Christ dwelling in the saint, endowing him or her with supernatural peace,

---

325 Maguire, Nectar and Illusion, 132.

326 #75 in Miller ed., Manuelis Philae Carmina 1, 34.

Εἰς τὴν ἀπὸ μαρμάρου στήλην τοῦ μεγαλομάρτυρος Γεωργίου

> Λίθος πονηθεὶς εἰς γληφὴν στεφανίτου
> Τὸν εἰς πόνους ἄκαμπτον ἐμφαίνει τόνον·
> Οὐκ ἦν γὰρ εἰκὸς ἐντυποῦσθαι ταῖς χρόαις
> Τὸν εἰς βάθος φέροντα σαρκὸς τὰς ξέσεις.

patience, wisdom, and other virtues. That dichotomy between material means and immaterial ends also gives the poet a wide range of figurative language to choose from in revealing the mystery. Although a short poem may focus on one metaphor, Byzantine poetry often employs multiple metaphors that do not necessarily correspond to a single metaphor, allegory or theme. It is not that the recurring theme of hagiographic epigrams is polyvalent so much as that rhetorical variety is necessary to draw the same theme from different lives and different icons in varying materials. The move to more colors and more variety in late Byzantine cameos also appears as an expansion of the garden motif that also is prominent in late Byzantine epigrams, as we shall see.

Another poem by Philes that Kalavrezou cites does not mention color in its praise of steatite but combines the metaphors we have seen already applied to Byzantine cameos and stone sculpture from an earlier date: the stone uncut by human hands, refined metal, the fire of divinity, and the garden.[327]

> To a Steatite Icon of the Mother of God
> You unburnt burning bush
> you have been carved perfect into the pure stone
> Before fire iron does not endure as (this) stone does.

327 Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, Byzantine Steatite, 81. The English translation is taken from Kalavrezou and the Greek from #95 in Miller, Manuelis Philae carmina 2, 146.

> Εἰς ἀμίαντον εἰκόνα τῆς θεομήτορος.
>
> Ἄφλεκτος ὑπάρξασα πυρφόρος βάτος
> Ἄμεμπτος εἰς ἄχραντον ἐξέσθης λίθον·
> Πρὸς γὰρ τὸ πῦρ σίδερος οὐ λίθος μένει·
> Κατάσκιον δὲ πάλιν εὑρέθης ὄρος
> Τῷ συνδετικῷ τῶν διεστώτων λίθῳ·
> Ἐγὼ δὲ πηγὴν εὐτυχῶν τεραστίων
> Τῷ τοῦ χρυσαργύρου σε κοσμῷ θριγγίῳ.
> Ναὶ κῆπε Χριστοῦ, ναὶ θεόδροσον φρέαρ,
> Τοὺς σοὺς αγωγοὺς δαψιλῶς ἀναστόμου·
> Τῆς πίστεως γὰρ τὴν χρησῆν κάλπιν φερω.

You were found again a mountain full of shadow.
For the stone binds together things that are set apart.
I adorn you, the source of marvelous blessings
with a border of gilded silver.
Indeed a garden of Christ, a well of god-like dew,
open your channels in abundance,
For I am carrying the golden vessel of faith.

Reaching back through Byzantine hymnography and biblical commentary, Philes uses all these metaphors for the Virgin in her role as Theotokos, the one who contains uncircumscribable divinity. Another translation for the third line would be, "Before the fire, iron not stone remains." Byzantines likely would have been familiar with the practice of burning marble scraps from local monuments to make the lime to mortar brick churches. Of course, the biblical metaphor of refining metal in the fire also would have been the common experience of Byzantines who visited smithies and jewelers to buy or repair metalwares. The mountain overshadowed by the cloud of divinity also helps to explain the Byzantine interest in relatively subdued steatites and cameos, rather than many white or white and dark ones. The binding stone presumably is the cornerstone that would hold the foundation of the church in place, a metaphor rife with associations with church revetment. Is the well of divine dew the furnace of Daniel and his friends? Certainly, the streams in the desert are another reference to the rock of Meribah and a type of the rivers of Paradise. In fact, most of the poem – even the paradoxical fire – can be associated somehow in an allegory of a new Eden, as well as the Virgin Mother of God, the new Eve.

Conclusions

Although scholars sometimes speak of Byzantine aesthetics as monolithic,[328] it is

328 Piatnitsky, 43.

important to note that this study's focus on stone already has uncovered a certain gap between marble icons, steatites and cameos. One poet may need to accommodate the pallor of marble in order to praise the saint, while steatites demand the language of verdure associated with their green color. Stones often were praised in the language of the garden that had long been used to praise church interiors, where revetment in colorful and variegated stones was an old Roman custom. Enamel icons also tended to repeat vegetal motifs that have roots in early Christian motifs of Paradise.[329] In considering a "Byzantine" aesthetic or aesthetics therefore, it is worth questioning whether there existed a single aesthetic principle, guiding concept or theological vision between Iconoclasm and the Fall of Constantinople.

Among all the variation in materials and compositions, the Byzantine icon in relief focused on portraiture almost exclusively, unlike mosaic and painting. The figure of a single saint or several, standing or in bust, was depicted against a blank background on ivories, steatites, copper panels, marble reliefs, enamels and gemstones from the latter tenth century until the end of Byzantium. The highly conventional writings that surrounded these icons usually praised the material, sometimes mentioning a hierarchy of the materials used, usually gold, silver, gems and pearls.[330] As the sample of Byzantine poetry in this study indicates, the same hierarchy of value was important to the poetic tradition that revolved around praising the saint, and often, the patron. After 1204 icons in gemstones, steatite and marble remain important, even as painted panel icons become the norm in

329 Maguire, Nectar and Illusion, 97-98. Pentcheva, The Sensual Icon, 117-19.

330 Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, Byzantine Icons in Steatite, 75-78. Appendix 1 in Pentcheva, The Sensual Icon, 211-222. Johannes Koder ed. Das Eparchenbuch Leons des Weisens (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften,1991), 2.1.

Byzantium. Where steatites include a lot of narrative scenes, cameos in the late Byzantine period come in a much wider range of stones, from transparent amethysts and sapphires to a red jasper mottled in various colors to translucent jadeites. Late Byzantine poetry also contains the variety of emphases popular from past periods, from abstract theological poems to praise of rich materials to poetry on the garden of Paradise.

Given the continuity of other media over the Byzantine period, why did cameos suddenly admit a variety of stones in the late Byzantine period? Part of the answer likely is the Crusades. From the fall of the Komnenian dynasty in 1187 onward, the basic political order went from a highly centralized state that revolved politically, economically and culturally around Constantinople to multiple states in the Balkans and Anatolia: Bulgaria, Serbia, Trebizond, Nicea, Thessaloniki, Epiros and the Morea. The stone pendants that come from Russia around the twelfth century onwards add to the suspicion that the transparent "Byzantine cameos" that are found there today were made locally and reflect new trade with Italian and Mongolian partners. The amethyst and white agate cameos now in Kassel, Germany, may well be local works of stones that came through new Mediterranean trading patterns of the Holy Roman Empire.

Another possibility is that the use of the objects changed. The analysis of this study suggests that their format and iconic compositions always made them best suited to public display as pendants in luxury mounts, that is pectorals or enkolpia. Some examples of enkolpia with their gems and space for relics are preserved from the end of the Byzantine period. However, earlier Byzantine poetry refers to enkolpia containing stones. One poem of the early twelfth century lauds a container of stones from the Holy Land commissioned

by Michael Alousianos.[331]

> From the place of prayer it brings forth, bearing wood
> of the cross of Christ, as well as stones of [the] tomb of [the] Word's mother,
> the mounts of Olives, Golgotha [and] Sinai.

Here the traditional use of enkolpia to contain bits of the True Cross adds stones from the Holy Land.[332] For the culture of the Byzantine period, it shows how important physical place and materials remained to the veneration of sacred images. Icons did not replace relics after Iconoclasm, but Byzantine piety and image production remained rooted in corporeality as well as contemplation. A slightly later poem of the early thirteenth century is more abstract but remains focused on the enkolpion as a sacred stone.[333]

> Holding you on [my] heart's tablet, O Virgin,
> tablet of God's word, as if inscribed
> I bear [you] now even before my breasts as a portal stone
> Your Theodore the Doukas-begetting servant.

The image of the slab with laws engraved on it goes back into biblical (compare Deuteronomy 6:6 and Ezekiel 36), even ancient Near Eastern custom. Here the poet likely

---

331 #215 in Lampros, "Ho Markianos Kodix 524," 144. See #41 that specifies the same patron's enkolpion of part of the skull of St. Theodore Gabras, who died in 1099. Although this Michael Alousianos cannot be he of the earlier century, the family was influential in Byzantine politics through the fourteenth century. See "Alousianos" in The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium ed. Alexander P. Kazhdan (Oxford UP, 1991), 1: 70.

> Τόπου προσευχῆς ἐκφυὲν φέρων ξύλον
> Σταυροῦ τε Χριστοῦ καὶ τάφου μητρὸς λόγου,
> ὄρους Ἐλαιῶν, Γολγοθᾶ, Σινᾶ λίθους.

332 Anna Kartsonis, "Protection Against all Evil: Function, Use and Operation of Byzantine Historiated Phylacteries," Byzantinische Forschungen 20 (1994): 73-102. Holger A. Klein, Byzanz, das Westen und das 'wahre Kreuz': die Geschichte einer Reliquie und ihrer künstlerischen Fassung in Byzanz und im Abendland (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2004). Brigitte Pitarakis, Les croix-reliquaires pectorales byzantines en bronze (Paris: Picard, 2006).

333 # 54 in Klein, Byzanz, das Westen und das 'wahre Kreuz', 22. Theodore Doukas joined his brother Michael in ruling Epiros in 1210, taking over from him in 1215 and ruling until 1230. After putting his son in charge of Epiros, Thessaly and Macedonia, he died in 1253.

> Ἐν καρδίας ἔχων σε πλαξὶ, Παρθένε,
> θεοῦ λόγου πλὰξ ὥσπερ ἐγγεγλυμμένην
> ὡς θυρεὸν νῦν καὶ πρὸ τῶν στέρνων φέρω
> Θεόδωρος σὸς Δουκοφυὴς οἰκέτης.

invokes Jeremiah 31:33 and Hebrews 8:10, which command the faithful to write God's law on their hearts. By specifically envisioning the cameo as a portal stone, the poem also recalls the tomb of Christ. This reciprocity between Christ as God's word and the law of the Lord helps to explain the move from bronze cruciform enkolpia to round enkolpia with cameos in the middle Byzantine era. With the onset of the Crusades, the pilgrimage sites of Byzantium and the Holy Land became the literal grounds where West met East and contested for the meaning of Christian history. Even here on the mount of Olives and at the tomb of Christ, the garden set sacred space off from everyday experience.

In regard to this recurring emphasis on stone and garden, can the shift in Byzantine gemstones for cameos really be due to changing aesthetics? Liz James rightly notes the common use of adjectives like brilliant or radiant in Byzantine texts.[334] Their common use for opaque stones and the relative lack of poetry on glass or enamel, however, imply that reflectance was not as important as hue. Particularly in regard to stones, the discussion of gleaming pavement, columns and revetments suggests that the light actually comes from the substance itself rather than being reflected. In fact, James ascribes to the Byzantines an ideology of color that supposedly maps the truth of their experiential reality.[335] This view of coloring would stand in contrast with the Renaissance emphasis on outlines, geometry and the representation of space. What is clear from James' presentation is that during Iconoclasm, color was a key term of debate that represented Iconophile claims to a scientific reality.

For the elite Byzantine beholder, color supposedly represented the substance of

334 Liz James, Light and Colour in Byzantine Art, 77-80.

335 Ibid., 130-37.

objects as they were observed in the world and accurately depicted living things. This view may help to explain why human figures were not colored in ivories or on cameos. Whether a figure was perceived as pale, green or some other color; the integrity of the figure was what communicated its truth to the Byzantine beholder. The difficulty of reworking stone images would have left them with a kind of authenticity that painting lacked, at least until the Iconoclasm of Leo of Chalcedon in the late eleventh century.[336] While painted icons did rise to prominence in the twelfth century though, the images in painted icons continued to be surrounded by luxurious metal and enamel revetments that belie any economic necessity to use painted panels. Byzantine patrons also continued to commission stone icons and poetry that glorifies them, so it is unlikely that the theology of icons suddenly devalued the integrity of the figure. Indeed, icon revetments display the figure's colors by surrounding it in gleaming, often abstract surfaces. Did icon revetments suddenly preach an aesthetic of light as fire, as Pentcheva proposes? Their motifs actually were that of the garden, which became a dominant motif in literature too from the twelfth century.

Along with enamel icon revetments, the enamel icon of the archangel in San Marco, Venice, [Fig. 32] standing in a garden dates to the twelfth century.[337] The first impression of the enameled garden from a distance is how red and white spots fleck the dark blue and green ground. On closer inspection, one clearly discerns the green tendrils that snake up out of abstract pots or for flowers or outline small cypress trees. Red and white leaves and dots hang from these tendrils in unpredictable patterns to enliven the

336 Anne-Marie Weyl Carr, "Leo of Chalcedon and the Icons," Byzantine East, Latin West: Studies in Honor of Kurt Weitzmann (Princeton, 1995). Charles Barber, Contesting the Logic of Painting: Art and Understanding in Eleventh-Century Byzantium (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

337 # 19 in Treasury of San Marco. David Buckton's comparisons suggest a date well into the twelfth century.

landscape, but the standing figure of the archangel rises in brightly gilded relief above the otherwise flat expanse of garden and, perhaps, blue sky. The effect of the dark ground is much like that of the cameos that range from green with red spots to very dark green. The archangel not only guarded the gates of Paradise, but also became an increasingly political protector for emperors and dynasties, such as the Angelids and Russian princes. It is significant then that St. Michael should stand literally in the courts of power, that is the garden framed by an arcade. Is this the garden of emperors or the garden of Eden or have they been conflated?

A similar garden motif is connected with the Theotokos, who long had been praised in such terms in Byzantine hymnography. However, she also appears enlivening earth and ocean in an icon of the Annunciation found at St. Katherine's Monastery on Mt. Sinai.[338] Unlike early Christian mosaics that put Christ at the center of the rivers of Paradise, the saints now appear in gardens that suggest their location and participation in the liveliness of Paradise. It is tempting to place her, along with the archangel, in a distant and spiritual Paradise, but the illuminations of homilies by monk James Kokkinobaphos suggest that the saints enliven creation even on earth.[339] The deluxe illuminations of events from the life of the Virgin [Fig. 88], here her rest on a journey, feature lush vegetation and the horror vacui noted in the enamel icon of St. Michael in the garden, as well as one of St. Theodore slaying a dragon in Moscow from the same time. These historical scenes all introduce movement into a landscape of natural superabundance, indicative of Paradise in

338 Henry Maguire, Nectar and Illusion, 69.

339 Irmgard Hutter and Paul Canart eds., Marien-homilien: Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1162 2 vols. (Zurich: Belser, 1991).

Byzantine sources.[340]

From the paradisaical description of the church of St. George in Mangana on, the garden increasingly moves beyond the confines of emperors and saints to become the site of inner realization for Byzantines. St. Gregory Nazianzen, whom the Byzantines called the Theologian, is depicted writing his homilies in a room surrounded by marble revetments rich in various colors and by a garden marked by fountains [Fig. 89].[341] The stones are speckled, streaked and mottled in green, porphyry, blue and black with white. It is hard to imagine the illuminator inured to hue, employing bright colors solely as an expression of tone with no contrasting dark or mute colors.[342] The room almost could be a garden kiosk, as the space sits directly on an ashlar wall with fountains in the portals flanked by gardens behind low carved marble plaques. To either side of the church father are doors that seem to lead higher into the serried towers and cupolas of the church that frame the top of the scene. Here it literally is the saint in the center of the illumination who joins earth to heaven through his wisdom and work. In a contemporary Gospelbook now in the Pantokrator Monastery on Mt. Athos, the evangelists, Mark and Luke, also appear in gardens conspicuously marked with fountains.[343] In the rise of the Byzantine romance too, ordinary people met in gardens to mull over their extraordinary circumstances.[344] Educated residents of Constantinople would have walked in gardens like the ones in these

340 Henry Maguire, Nectar and Illusion: Nature in Byzantine Art and Literature (Oxford UP, 2012), 92-98.

341 Sinai gr. 339 fol. 4v dates to the middle of the twelfth century. See #63 in Glory of Byzantium: Art and Culture of the Middle Byzantine Era, A.D. 843-1261 eds. Helen C. Evans and William D. Wixom (NY: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1997), 109-10.

342 James, Light and Colour in Byzantine Art, 77-80.

343 #5.9 in Treasures of Mount Athos ed. Athanasios A. Karakatsanis (Thessaloniki: Holy Community of Mount Athos, 1997), 235.

pious illuminations and read about young lovers in such gardens at their literary seances.

The garden motif certainly had been the domain of saints and courtiers for a long time before the Byzantine period, but the surprising aspect of its use in Byzantium is how ambiguous and prevalent a trope it is to envision an intellectually and spiritually complete life. While Byzantine writers often imagined pallor as spiritually positive, they seem to have longed ultimately for a transformation of their own world into a living Paradise. It is precisely this equation of Christ and the saint with a garden or meadow that we see reflected in Byzantine marble revetment, steatites, cameos and even mosaics. The early Byzantine program of earth and ocean has not disappeared so much as become integrated into a whole vocabulary of stone and metal, where poikilia is the montage or assembly of a diversity of pure materials. Stone forged naturally by the pressures and mixing of elements beneath the earth; metals refined and forged in precise stages in the blinding flames of the furnace; and the mixing and firing of sandy beaches and their scrubby bushes into a liquid then solid all represent the mystical union of the diversity of Creation into the unity of a new divine reality.

344 Otmar Schissel, Der byzantinische Garten: Seine Darstellung in gleichzeitigen Romane (Vienna: Akad. der Wiss. in Wien, 1942). Antony R. Littlewood, "Romantic Paradises: The Role of the Garden in Byzantine Romances," BMGS 5 (1979): 95-114. J. Wolschke-Buhlman, "Zwischen Kepos und Paradeisos: Fragen zur byzantinischen Gartenkultur," Das Gartenamt 4 (1992): 221-228. On this new psychology in Byzantine depictions of the Annunciation see Henry Maguire, "The Self-Conscious Angel: Character Study in Byzantine Paintings of the Annunciation," Harvard Ukrainian Studies 7 (1983), 384-85.

Conclusion

The dissertation arose from the premise that Byzantine cameos form a neglected – indeed, largely unknown – body of artistic material in the Middle Ages. Most museums only hold a handful of them and exhibitions rarely focus on jewelry, so they have remained all but invisible to collectors, museums and scholars. Dr. Christian Schmidt in Munich is the rare collector who has focused on small Byzantine objects. Hans Wentzel and Alice bank were exceptional in devoting the bulk of their careers to Byzantine and Medieval cameos. The Cabinet des Médailles and the Musée du Louvre are exceptional in holding some two dozen Byzantine cameos in Paris, not to mention important holdings of Western Medieval cameos. Even as they stand with ivories and metalwork as important documents of a lost civilization, their importance for understanding Byzantine art lies in their durability.

Gemstones are not easily recut and they cannot be melted down or burned up. Like an airplane's mysterious "black box," the corpus of Byzantine cameos presumably records Byzantine tastes with very little loss. It admittedly documents those tastes for a very narrow type of object, that is the icon, but the icon arguably was the single most important category of Byzantine art. By the icon of course, I mean the image reproduced in diverse media from a sacred archetype. If nothing else, Byzantine cameos serve as a kind of control group that helps us to recognize the basically normal number and types of icons in steatite and ivory, for example. Their form, which probably was set in golden mounts, perhaps with pearls, also echoes the clipeate images in marginal psalters just after Iconoclasm, that is the typical motif of clipeated saints in mosaic programs and the busts of

saints sculpted on lintels and capitals. Along with Byzantine cameos, these occurrences of clipeated images against a blank background actually differentiate the Byzantine icon from the sacred portrait of late Antiquity, which usually represented saints in fictive Roman interiors. Byzantine cameos effectively demonstrate the reality of theological pronouncements about divine archetypes being reproduced in various media and contexts. Unfortunately, their removal from any original mounts leaves us with only a vague notion of their contexts.

Chapter 1 Middle Byzantine Cameos (9th–12th c.)

The survey of middle Byzantine cameos found that nearly all of the examples produced between around 900 and 1200 were dark green to almost black. Of the few middle Byzantine cameos in lapis lazuli, the two in the Hermitage [Cat. 9] and [Cat. 61] are much larger than most Byzantine cameos and have a flat bottom, more like icons than typical cameos. The relatively early sard of Christ Pantokrator with a plea for Despot Leo [Cat. 6, Fig. 15] also employs this iconic format in a more typical size. The red jasper of Daniel in the Lions' Den in the Benaki Museum [Cat.85, Fig.37] and the sardonyx of saints Demetrios and George in the Cabinet des Médailles [Cat.83, Fig. 25] both seem to be late twelfth-century exceptions that prove the rule of dark prase or bloodstone cameos in the middle Byzantine period.

From an archeological perspective, the question remains why Byzantine lapidaries chose such a narrow range of stones. So few pieces of Western Medieval glyptic can be dated before the thirteenth century that they cannot offer endpoints for understanding the wider circulation of gemstones in the Mediterranean. Islamic glyptic so far has been

documented in pieces of cut rock crystal, whose origin remains uncertain. Western Europeans had access to garnets from the end of the Roman period. They also had begun to obtain emeralds from Austria by the eighth century. Where the sudden supply of agates and sardonyx came from in the thirteenth century is mysterious. Many Byzantine works carved from steatite in this period survive, as do Russian works carved in a local schist. Since some Byzantine and Arab documents mention gift exchanges of precious stones, we are left to wonder to what extent this narrow range of gems in the middle period was a matter of trade and to what extent it reflected Byzantine aesthetics. This study does oppose the two conditions, assuming that steatite or bloodstone were desirable among several local stones, such as hematite, schist or others.

Another striking aspect of middle Byzantine cameos, along with steatites and ivories, is their opacity. Even the clipeate portraits of saints in mosaic, such as at Hosios Loukas, seem drowned out in a sea of gold tesserae. This choice to limit the gaze to the material substrate is as peculiar to the middle Byzantine experience of reality as Abbot Suger's rhapsody on transparent materials is to the Gothic mentality. The saintly figure that rises from its material substrate remains inextricably bound to it, although the Byzantines described this very quality as lifelike. Whether as an impression or a cast reproduction of the archetype, the middle Byzantine cameo is a dark, stony relief.

Although a minority of examples are cut in an angular style, the monumentalizing trend of the brown Leo jasper [Cat. 6, Fig. 15] dominates middle Byzantine glyptic, much as in contemporary relief icons in ivory, marble and steatite. The puffy volumes of the large serpentine roundel inscribed to Nikephoros III Botaneiates (r. 1078-1081) [Cat. 37, Fig.21] are a good example of how a frontal figure was excavated in successive planes with

little rotation of the figure. This method would have allowed the artisan in any medium to outline the planes of the figure and then excavate them in succession. Although even Iconoclast emperors presumably needed artisans to glorify them, the widespread use of the same technique in several media suggests that Roman sculpture as a three-dimensional enterprise had ended by the ninth century. Only a handful of Byzantine ivory boxes attempt the three-dimensional sculpture of Antiquity. In glyptic though, excavating the material around a figure arguably was more demanding than creating an intaglio. The jeweler used a spinning metal disk to cut away material in a process that did not allow him to cover up mistakes by drilling deeper into the stone. In that technical achievement, Byzantine cameos reflect a clear sculptural intent, as the jeweler could just as easily have drawn the scheme of a saint in angular cuts on the stone's surface. He did that in a few exceptional cases that prove the sculptural rule. All of which reinforces the idea that middle Byzantine patrons wanted icons sculpted as integral traces of the divine in physical material.

Chapter 2 Late Byzantine Cameos (13th–15th c.)

What Byzantines intended in late Byzantine cameos is more difficult, because the corpus of late Byzantine cameos demonstrates such a sudden diversity of materials, styles and subjects. As already noted in a few cases, the late twelfth century seems to have heralded an expanding range of coloration in Byzantine cameos. However, the last firmly dateable Byzantine cameo is a two-sided bloodstone in Venice's Cini Collezione inscribed to "Alexios Doukas" V Mourtzouphlos [Cat. 102, Fig. 22-23]. The cameos on objects in the Troitse-Sergieva Lavra presumably acquired from the chartering of the monastery in

1355 on and reflect late Byzantine glyptic. The sixteenth-century metalwork frame (riznitsa in Slavonic) around the icon of St. Sergius holds the cameos that serve as examples of late Byzantine glyptic. Their style and materials are the only clues to their late Byzantine provenance, which admittedly introduces a potential circularity in their dating. This handful of cameos just north of Moscow does seem to represent the diversity of materials and styles found throughout late Byzantine cameos, though.

The most significant series of cameos is those of the Old Testament prophet, Daniel, which encompasses eleven examples from the end of the twelfth century through end of the Byzantine period. Seven feature Daniel in the lions' den, all but one in banded onyx or sardonyx. These cameos follow the standard iconography and materials of twelfth-century glyptic. The remaining four examples represent a bust of the prophet holding open a scroll and one of the prophet pointing up. Their iconography specifically follows late Byzantine dress and they appear in bloodstone, sardonyx and a chalcedony. What is paradigmatic at this stage of the study is how the two groups exemplify the relative uniformity of middle Byzantine examples and relative diversity of late Byzantine examples. I have argued that several of the onyx/sardonyx cameos of Daniel in the Lion's Den likely were produced within a couple of decades of the Fourth Crusade, perhaps even in the West, but it is impossible at this stage to disentangle them precisely because of their relative uniformity.

What this divide in Daniel cameos indicates is not a sudden change in glyptic so much as a sudden expansion of glyptic within the Byzantine orbit. This expansion was not numerical, as slightly more and more assuredly Byzantine cameos date from the middle Byzantine period. In the late Byzantine period though, one encounters agates, amethysts,

chalcedonies, jadeite, jaspers, sapphires and sapphirines along with the more traditional bloodstone and sardonyx cameos. The bloodstone cameos that appear in this period often have inclusions in yellow in addition to red. Jaspers are mottled. Transparent gems like amethyst, jadeite and sapphire traditionally came from India, presumably via Islamic states. The temptation is to see an expanded range of trading partners after the Fourth Crusade, which logically would implicate the Italian city states. By the fourteenth century, amethyst was abundant in Bohemia. Jasper/sard/bloodstone is such an ordinary mineral that it and the new bloodstones might well have come from within the new Byzantine states of the late period. From wherever the new stones appeared the exciting conclusion of studying late Byzantine cameos is that late Byzantine culture was as aesthetically diverse as its cameos. This culture is one of exhilarating openness to innovations in the arts, even if the subjects of late Byzantine cameos remain steadfastly traditional.

Chapter 3 Theology of Stone

The survey of Byzantine glyptic immediately confronts a radical discontinuity between Byzantine cameos and Roman ones that leads to the question of what motivated Byzantine glyptic. Although the coming of Islam and a Western Medieval imperium may help account for what stones were available to carve, the radical continuity of Byzantine cameos from the tenth through sixteenth centuries suggests their ideological potency. Among social institutions, the church of Constantinople arguably became the only real force that rivaled an every-shifting series of political dynasties. For reasons that remain not entirely clear, the church promulgated a series of canons in 692 that were intended to be universal norms for Christians even under Roman and Armenian jurisdiction, both of

which rejected them on principle. This so-called Council in Trullo banned the use of symbolism to represent sacred figures, rationalizing Christian images as the means to accurately envision sacred history and to spiritually connect with the sacred persons depicted. The Christian image, whatever else its power over mind or emotions, officially became an icon in the Piercean sense that referred a believer's prayers to the saint in Heaven. As Henry Maguire has shown, the Byzantine tradition of iconography also demanded indexicality of the sacred image in terms of titulature, costume and physiognomy.

With a narrow range of iconography open to the artisan, this chapter probed the assumption that Byzantines held an ideological or spiritualizing view of stone or gemstones as artistic materials. The most erudite Byzantines copied and read ancient Greek works on magic, medicine and religion, so it is surprising to discover that Byzantine intellectuals occasionally commented on those sources with almost universal disdain. Gemstones might have physical properties, but they largely were aesthetic objects to the educated Byzantine reader. Byzantine intellectuals clearly became interested in alchemy, symbolizing interpretation of stones, and a detailed astrology in the fourteenth century, but this burst of enthusiasm for natural philosophy comes much too late to explain the basic motivations of Byzantine cameos.

In turning to the large volume of middle Byzantine theological writings though, one quickly discovers that stone was a crucial trope for the divine action in the material world. The plight of the thirsty Israelites at Meribah was frequently depicted in Byzantine illumination, although the illuminator oftens adds the figure Christ working the miracle, since “that rock was Christ” in St. Paul's words. The issue there is not whether divine grace

can punctuate human life but the growing theological certainty that Christ had always been the intermediary between a transcendent god and material existence. Picturing Jesus performing Old Testament theophanies therefore underlined the need for an incarnate god who had exposed his face to humanity. Likewise the Life of St. Nikon of Sparta (†998) records two instances when the saint struck water in the deserted countryside of Greece. Sacred springs long had been tapped by saints, but St. Nikon explicitly appears as a new Moses. A thirteenth-century marble relief icon of the Theotokos Anoiketos now in Venice also invokes the Mosaic miracle as sign of the Incarnation. Physical sustenance at its most basic then becomes linked to the sacred image as an outpouring of divine presence. Byzantine commentators and artisans do not hint at any thought of the stone transforming into water, so the most direct conclusion is that what they valued in all of these miracles was the image of Christ as an innately powerful scheme hidden within the fabric of Creation. If we ask not what was important in stone itself so much as why stone was important, we begin to discover stone's power to record the divine imprint.

However, the touchstone for Byzantine interpretations of stone as a material was the prophet Daniel's dream of an unhewn stone that smashed the clay feet of the imperial statue and brought forth an eternal kingdom, envisioned as an icon of Christ from the end of Iconoclasm to the end of the Byzantine era. This motif of a stone image not made by human hands figured in the mythology of the acheiropoietos image of Christ's face as it came into contact with a brick and left an image or impression in the keramion. It also may inform the relic slab of anointing that supposedly bore the impression of Christ's body, which was had been kept in Jerusalem for pilgrims to reverence and was transferred to Constantinople in 1169-70. In a similar manner, the body of St. Nikon of Sparta (†998)

left a miraculous impression, when he was laid out in the monastic church for the funeral service. The stone icon therefore became a trope for the divine trace in the middle Byzantine period. The implication is precisely that stone could not be manipulated like metal or paint but presented a durable record of divine presence or absence within human history.

Chapter 4 Aesthetics of Stone

Theological ideas can help explain why sculpture was critical to Byzantine representations of sacred figures, even why stone sculpture was favored over metal. However, it does not explain the aesthetics that guided the wide range of Byzantine icons in stone, from gemstone cameos to large marble reliefs. The Council in Trullo (692) merely constrained artisans to portray historically plausible figures in suitably fine arts and to avoid symbolism. No further canons or treatises on Byzantine art are extant before the so-called Painter's Manual of the later fourteenth century. The only lexicon of the Byzantine period, the Souda, provides only arbitrary notes on artistic terms. It is therefore surprising that studies of Byzantine aesthetics largely focus on color terminology or artistic effects. Most of what survives of Byzantine cultural output are minor arts, including manuscript illustration, and epigrams praising icons. This study consequently explored Byzantine poetry to explain what Byzantine beholders found compelling in their art.

Employing the Byzantine epigram to understand aesthetics is hardly a scientific exercise though, as the genre describes icons more in the theoretical sense than as art objects. The titles of epigrams always mention the subject but do not consistently document the format or material of the image. Often the title mentions a patron and a

shrine where the image was kept or installed. The epigrams themselves usually mention the saint and often allude to the image's material, but these poems served as works of art in their own right. Therefore, the recent trend to study epigrams integrated into buildings and icons cannot ultimately "unlock" the meaning of Byzantine art works, because Byzantine patrons and artisans valued words and things equally for what each had to offer.

Epigrams most often dwell on the whiteness of marble and the brilliance of gold that typically adorned churches as a simple reflection on the default context of Byzantine icons with the setting of worship. Epigrams on ascetics, such as Basil the Great or John Chrysostom, highlight the pallor of these ascetics. The implication is that fasting and praying indoors gave them a light complexion and spiritual insight, from which comes the Antique trope of monasticism as the "angelic life." Martyrs, on the other hand, usually led mundane lives that resulted in their conflict with the imperial cult or other religions. When epigrams contrast the pallor of St. George's icon with his bloody martyrdom, they are almost certainly describing works in marble to spiritual effect. Just as the rhetoric of holiness demands that the poet highlight the pallor of ascetics, the same rhetoric of spiritual perfection demands that the poet stress the violent struggle of martyrs in attaining holiness. Ultimately, these notions of pallor as a lack of color and unadulterated color help communicate the positive aesthetic of spiritual purity.

By contrast, recent scholarly discussion has explored the eclecticism and rich aesthetics of art in terms of what Byzantine beholders characterized as poikilia, that is variety. Art historians long have appreciated the rich materials and techniques of Byzantine art, but the tendency to characterize the spiritual aims of icons as

dematerializing created a problem relating art to aesthetics and theology. This study shows how the motif of the garden, which usually is studied in terms of imperial discourse, begins to appear increasingly as a discourse of sacred history as well in Byzantine writings and objects. The revival of a whole tradition of Septuagint illumination from the middle of the eleventh century is the first clear sign of such thinking. The rich garden landscapes that illuminate the twelfth-century sermons of James Kokkinobaphos on the Theotokos [Fig. 88] appears to be an extension of that concept. The rich enameled cloister or court garden [Fig. 32] in which the Archangel Michael stands on a contemporary icon in Venice is another example that pushes the garden from a narrative context into the icon. A frenetic icon of the Annunciation on Mt. Sinai with rooftop garden and riverine lower border has been dated to the twelfth century on just such a rhetorical revival. What links all of these disparate examples, though, is just how varied their surfaces and colors and compositions are.

I have argued that the rise of the garden motif helps explain why green stones become the preeminent material for cameos in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. By spiritualizing the site of variegated physical experience, the notion of verdure evoked eternal life. The middle Byzantine writer envisioned Paradise as the end of human perfection, rather than a dematerialized intellectual life in Heaven. Steatite and bloodstone tend to be employed in mute or dark green by the Byzantine jeweler, perhaps to reflect both the purity and life pictured in the heavenly vision of saints. As the large serpentine roundel inscribed to Nikephoros III Botaneiates (1078-80) reveals [Fig. 21], even rather dull green stones could possess a lively play of tonality reminiscent of a verdant meadow.

In the late Byzantine period, the classic bloodstone now sometimes includes yellow or light green spots in addition to red ones. By comparison with the brown jasper Pantokrator inscribed to Despot Leo [Cat. 6, Fig.15], the sardonyx cameos of the thirteenth century are cut generally in three layers and a combination of black, blue, brown and white [Cat. 83, Fig. 25]. While the technique generally imitates Roman imperial cameos, their frontal and hieratic scheme evokes the Byzantine icon. They have departed from the garden motif in coloration but prove the expanding aesthetic of poikilia through the middle and late Byzantine periods.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Albertus Magnus. Book of Minerals. Translated with a commentary by Dorothy Wyckoff. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.

Athanasius. Life of Antony and the Letter to Marcellinus. Translated and edited by Robert C. Gregg. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1980.

Christophori Mitylenaii Versuum Variorum Collection Cryptensis. Edited by Marc de Groote. Turnhout: Brepols, 2012.

Constantinople in the early eighth century: the Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai Introduction, translation, and commentary by Averil Cameron and Judith Herrin. Leiden: Brill, 1984.

Cosmas Indicopleustes.Topographie chrétienne. Edited and translated by Wanda Wolska-Conus. Sources chrétienne 141, 159, 197. Paris: CERF, 1968.

Cramer, J. A. Anecdota graeca e codd. Manuscriptis bibliothecae regiae parisiensis. Oxford, 1841.

Cyril of Alexandria. Glaphyra in exodum. In PG: 69.

Digenis Akritis: The Grottaferrata and Escorial versions. Edited and translated by Elizabeth Jeffreys. Cambridge UP, 1998.

Das Eparchenbuch Leons des Weisen. Translated and edited by Johannes Koder. Vienna: österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991.

Germanus of Constantinople. On the Divine Liturgy Translated and introduced by Paul Meyendorff. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984.

Gregory Nazianzen. On God and Christ. Translated and edited by Lionel Wickham. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002.

Gregory of Nyssa. Life of Moses. Translation, introduction and notes by Abraham J. Malherbe and Everett Ferguson. NY: Paulist Press, 1978.

——. Contra Eunomium. 1-2: Gregorii Nysseni Opera. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

——. De spiritu sancto. 3: Gregorii Nysseni Opera. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Jewish Travellers in the Middle Ages: 19 Firsthand Accounts. Edited with an introduction by Elkan Nathan Adler. London: Routledge, 1930 reprinted New York: Dover, 1987.

John of Damascus. Three Treatises On the Divine Images. Edited and translated by Andrew Louth. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003.

Kniga palomnik skazaniia mest' Sviatykh vo Tsaregrade Antoniia Arkhiepiskopa novogodskogo v 1200 gody [Guidebook of the story of the holy places in the imperial city of Antonii Archbishop of Novogod in the year 1200]. Edited by Hr. M. Loparev. St. Petersburg, 1899.

The Life of St. Andrew the Fool. Edited and translated by Lennart Ryden. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Uppsaliensis, 1995.

Liudprand of Cremona. Complete Works of Liudprand of Cremona. Edited with an introduction by Paolo Squatriti. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 2007.

Michael Psellos. Chronographia. Translated by E.R.A. Sewter. New Haven: Yale UP, 1953.

Oecumenius of Trikka. Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. In PG 118.

Opus Caroli regis contra synodum (Libri Carolini). Edited by Ann Freeman with Paul Meyvaert. Monumenta Germaniae Historiae, Legum sectio III, Concilia tomus 2, suppl. 1. Hannover: Hahn, 1998.

Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works. Edited by Colm Luibheid. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1987.

Russian Travelers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. Translated and edited by George Majeska. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1984.

Theodoret of Cyrrhus. Questions on the Octateuch. Translated and edited by John F. Petruccione and Robert C. Hill. Washington: Catholic University of America, 2007.

Theophylact of Ochrid. Exposition on the Acts of the Apostles. In PG 125.

——. Expositio in Epistolam I ad Corinthiam. In PG 124.

The Periplus Maris Erythraei. Translated and introduced by Lionel Casson. Princeton UP, 1989.

Vita S. Basilii Iunioris in A. N. Vesselovskij, "Razyskanija v oblasti russkago duhovnago stiha," Sbornik Otdelenija russkago jazyka i slovenosti Imperatorskoj akademii nauk 46 (1889-90): supp., 3-89

William of Malmesbury. Gesta regum anglorum. Translated and edited by #

Xanthopoulos, Nikephoros Kallistos. Die Kirchengeschichte des Nikephoros Callistus Xanthopulus und ihre Quellen. Edited by Günter Gentz with work by Friedhelm Winkelmann. Berlin: Akademic Verl., 1966.

Secondary Sources

Age of Spirituality: Late Antique and Early Christian Art, Third to Seventh Century. Edited by Kurt Weitzmann. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1979.

Alexander, Paul J. The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition Edited with an introduction by Dorothy deF. Abrahamse. Berkeley: U of California, 1985.

Anderson, Jeffrey C. "The Byzantine Panel Portrait before and after Iconoclasm." In The Sacred Image East and West. Edited by Leslie Brubaker and Robert Ousterhout. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1995: 25-44.

Art of Late Rome and Byzantium. Edited by Anna Gonosová and Christine Kondoleon. Richmond, VA: Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, 1994.

Ashtor, Eliyahu and Guidobaldo Cevidalli. "Levantine Alkaline Ashes and European Industries." Journal of European Economic History 12 (1983): 475-522.

Bank, Alice V. "Vier byzantinisierende Kameen aus der Hermitage." Beiträge zur Kunst des Mittelalters: Festschrift für Hans Wentzel zum 60. Geburtstag. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1975: 11-16.

——. "Sur le problème de la glyptique italo-byzantine." Rivista di studi byzantine e slavi (1983): 311-318.

Barb, Adolph A. "Lapis Adamas – Der Blutstein." Latomus: Hommages à Marcel Renard 101(1969): 66-82.

Barber, Charles. "The Koimesis Church, Nicaea." Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik 41 (1991): 43-60.

——. Figure and Likeness: The Limits of Representation. Princeton UP, 2002.

——. Contesting the Logic of Painting: Art and Understanding in Eleventh-Century Byzantium. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Bass, George F. et al. Serçe Limanı 2: The Glass of an Eleventh-Century Shipwreck. College Station, TX: Texas A & M UP, 2009.

Beaton, Roderick. The Medieval Greek Romance. 2nd revised edition. Cambridge UP, 1996.

Beaton, Roderick and David Ricks. Digenes Akrites: new approaches to Byzantine heroic Poetry. Aldershot: King's College London, 1993.

Behr, John. The Nicene Faith 2: One of the Holy Trinity. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004.

Beiträge zur Kunst des Mittelalters: Festschrift für Hans Wentzel zum 60. Geburtstag. Edited by Rüdiger Becksmann, Ulf-Dietrich Korn and Johannes Zahlten. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1975.

Belting, Hans. "Zur Skulptur aus der Zeit um 1300 in Konstantinopel." Münchner Jahrbuch 23 (1972): 63-100.

——. "An Image and its Function in the Liturgy: The Man of Sorrows in Byzantium," DOP 34 (1980-1981): 1-16.

——. "Kunst oder Objekt-Stil? Fragen zur Funktion der 'Kunst' in der 'Makedonischen Renaissance." In Byzanz und der Western: Studien der Kunst des europäischen Mittelalters. Edited by Irmgard Hutter. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1984: 65-83.

——. The Image and Its Public in the Middle Ages: Form and Function of Early Paintings of the Passion. Translated by Mark Bartusis and Raymond Meyer. New Rochelle, NY: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1990.

Bernabò, Massimo. Il Tretravangelo di Rabbula: Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 1.56 . Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 2008.

Bertelli, Gioia. "La porta di Monte Sant'Angelo tra storia e conservazione." In Le porte del Paradiso: Arte e tecnologia bizantina tra Italia e Mediterraneo. Edited by Antonio Iacobini. Rome: Campisano, 2009: 319-344.

Biswas, Arun Kumar. Minerals and Metals in Ancient India. Vol. 2: Indigenous Literary Evidence. New Delhi: D.K. Printworld, 2001.

Bloch, Herbert. "Origin and Fate of the Bronze Doors of Abbot Desiderius of Monte Cassino." DOP 41 (1987), 89-102.

Bradshaw, David. Aristotle East and West: Metaphysics and the Division of Christendom. Cambridge UP, 2004.

Brill, Robert H. "Chemical Analyses of the Zeyrek Camii and Karye Camii Glasses." DOP 59 (2005): 213-230.

Brown, Peter. The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity. U of Chicago, 1981.

Browning, Robert. "The patriarchal school at Constantinople in the twelfth century." Byzantion 32: 167–202.

Brubaker, Leslie. Vision and Meaning in Ninth-Century Byzantium: Image as Exegesis in the Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus. Cambridge UP, 1999.

Brubaker, Leslie and John Haldon eds. Byzantium in the Iconoclastic Era (ca. 680-850): The Sources, An Annotated Survey. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.

Bruhn de Hoffmeyer, Ada. Military Equipment in the Byzantine Manuscript of Scylitzes in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid. Vol. 5 of Gladius. Granada, 1966.

Buckton, David. "The mass-produced Byzantine Saint." In The Byzantine Saint edited by Sergei Hackel. London: Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, 1981: 187-189.

Buchthal, Hugo. The Miniatures of the Paris Psalter. London, 1938.

——. "The Exaltation of David." Journal for the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 37 (1974): 330-333.

Byrne, Eugene H. "Some Mediaeval Gems and Relative Values." Speculum 10/2 (Apr., 1935): 177-187.

Byzance: L'art byzantin dans les collections publiques françaises. Edited by Jannic Durand et al. Paris: Réunion, 1992.

Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Art. Athens: Byzantine and Christian Museum, 1985.

Byzantine Art in the Collections of Soviet Museums. Edited by Alice V. Bank. NY: Harry N. Abrams, 1978.

Byzantine Women and Their World. Edited by Ioli Kalavrezou, with contributions by Angeliki E. Laiou et al. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Art Museums, 2003.

Byzantium: 330-1453. Edited by Robin Cormack and Maria Vassilaki. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2008.

Byzantium: Faith and Power (1261-1557). Edited by Helen C. Evans. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2004.

Byzantium: Late Antique & Byzantine Art in Scandinavian Collections. Edited by Jens Fleischer, Øystein Hjort and Mikael Bøgh Rasmussen. Copenhagen: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, 1996.

Byzantium: Treasures of Byzantine Art and Culture from British Collections. Edited by David Buckton. London: British Museum, 1994.

Byzanz: Das Licht aus dem Osten: Kult und Alltag im Byzantinischen Reich, vom 4. bis 15. Jahrhundert. Edited by Christoph Stiegemann. Mainz: Von Zabern, 2001.

Calligaro, T. "The Origin of Ancient Gemstones Unveiled by PIXE, PIGE and μ-Raman Spectrometry." In X-Rays for Archaeology. Edited by M. Uda, G. Demortier, I. Nakai. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005: 101-112.

Cameo and Intaglio: Engraved Gems from the Sommerville Collection. Edited by Cornelius C. Vermeule. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania, 1956.

Carboni, Stefano. Glass from Islamic Lands. London: Thames & Hudson, 2001.

Carboni, Stefano, Giancarlo Lacerenza, and David Whitehouse. "Glassmaking in Medieval Tyre: The Written Evidence." Journal of Glass Studies 45 (2003): 139-149.

Catalogue of Rings: Victoria and Albert Museum, Department of Metalwork. Edited by C. C. Oman. London: Board of Education.

Catalogue of the Engraved Gems of the Post-classical Periods in the Department of British and mediaeval antiquities and ethnography in the British Museum. Edited by Ormonde Maddock Dalton. London, 1915.

Clarke, John. Jewellry of Tibet and the Himalayas. London: V & A, 2004.

Coche de la Ferté, Étienne. Le Camée Rothschild: un chef-d'oeuvre du Ive siècle après J.-C. Paris: Librairie Laurent Tisné, 1957.

Cormack, Robin. Writing in Gold: Byzantine Society and its Icons. Oxford UP, 1985.

Corrigan,Kathleen. Review of Anastasis: The Making of an Image by Anna D. Kartsonis. In The Art Bulletin 71/2 (Jun., 1989): 312-315.

——. Visual Polemics in the Ninth-Century Byzantine Psalters. Cambridge UP, 1992.

——. "Text and Image on an Icon of the Crucifixion at Mount Sinai." In Sacred Image, East and West. Edited by Robert Ousterhout and Leslie Brubaker. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, 1995: 45-62.

Cotsonis, John. "The Contribution of Byzantine Lead Seals to the Study of the Cult of the Saints (Sixth-Twelfth Century)." Byzantion 75 (2005): 383-497.

Cutler, Anthony. The Hand of the Master: Craftsmanship, Ivory, and Society in Byzantium (9th-11th centuries) . Princeton UP, 1994.

Davidson, Gladys R. "The Minor Objects." Corinth 12 (1952): iii-366.

Deér, Josef. "Die Basler Löwenkamee und die süditalienische Gemmenschnitt des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des abendländischen Protorenaissance." Zeitschrift für schweizerische archeologie und Kunstgeschichte 14 (1953): 129-158.

De Lespinasse, René and François Bonnardot. Les métiers et corporations de la ville de Paris: XIIIe siècle, le livre des métiers d'Étienne Boileau. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1879.

Dell'Acqua, Francesca. "Enhancing Luxury through Stained Glass, from Asia Minor to Italy." DOP 59 (2005): 193-211.

De Montesquiou-Fezensac, Blaise and Danielle Gaborit-Chopin. "Camées et intailles du trésor de Saint-Denis." Cahiers Archéologiques 24 (1975): 137-162.

Dennert, Martin. "Kameo: Daniel in der Löwengrube", "Kameo: Johannes der Evangelist" and "Kreuzreliquiar Henrichs II.: Kameo mit heiligem Paulus." In Rom und Byzanz: Schatzkammerstücke aus bayerischen Sammlungen. Edited by Reinhold Baumstark with Birgitt Borkopp, Rainer Kahsnitz, Marcell Restle et al. Munich: Hirmer, 1998.

De Wald, Ernest T. Psalms and Odes: Vaticanus Graecus 752 volume 3, part 2 of Illustrations in the Manuscripts of the Septuagint. Princeton UP, 1942.

Die Antiken Gemmen des Kunsthistorischen Museums in Wien 3 vols. Edited by Erika Zwierlein-Diehl. Munich: Prestel Vlg., 1973.

Die Kameen im Kunsthistorischen Museum. Edited by Fritz Eichler and Ernst Kris. Vienna: Anton Scholl, 1927.

Die Welt von Byzanz: Europas ostliches Erbe: Glanz, Krisen und Fortleben einer tausendjahrigen Kultur. Edited by Ludwig Wamser. Stuttgart: K. Theiss, 2004.

Die Ziet der Staufer: Geschichte, Kunst, Kultur. Edited Reiner Haussherr 5 vols. Stuttgart: Württembergisches Landesmuseum, 1977.

Djurić, Vojislav J. Sopoćani. Leipzig: Veb E. A. Seeman Vlg., 1967.

Dorival, Gilles. Les chaînes exégétiques grecques sur les Psaumes 4 vols. Leuven: Peeters, 1986.

——. "La postérité littéraire des chaînes exégétique grecques." *Revue des études byzantines* 43 (1985): 209-226.

Dunn, Archibald. "The Kommerkiarios, the Apotheke, the Dromos, the Vardarios, and The West." Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 17 (1993): 3-24.

Early Christian and Byzantine Art. Edited by Marvin Chauncey Ross. Baltimore: Walters Art Gallery, 1947.

Etingof, O. E. Vizantiiskie ikony VI-pervoi poloviny XIII veka v Rossii [Byzantine Icons of the 6th to the first half of the 13th c. in Russia]. Moscow: Indrik, 2005.

Everyday Life in Byzantium. Edited by Demetra Papanikola-Bakirtzi. Athens: Kapon, 2002.

Francis, Peter, Jr. Asia's Maritime Bead Trade: 300 BC to the Present. Honolulu: U of Hawaii, 2002.

Freestone, Ian C. , Yael Gorin-Rosen, and Michael J. Hughes. "Primary Glass from Israel and the Production of Glass in Late Antiquity and the Early Islamic Period." In La route du verre: Ateliers primaires et secondaires du second millénaire av. J.-C. au Moyen Âge. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient, 2000: 65-83.

Fricke, Beate. "Fallen idols and risen saints: western attitudes toward the worship of images and the 'cultura veterum deorum'." In Negating the Image: Case Studies in Iconoclasm. Edited by Anne McClanan and Jeffrey Johnson. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005: 67-95.

Gil, Moshe. "The Radhanite Merchants and the Land of Radhan." Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient 17/3 (September, 1974): 299-328.

——. "The Jewish Merchants in Light of the Eleventh-Century Geniza Documents." Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient 46/3 (2003): 273-319.

Glory of Byzantium: Art and Culture of the Middle Byzantine Period, A.D. 843-1261. Edited by Helen C. Evans and William D. Wixom. NY: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1997.

The Gold-Glass Collection of the Vatican Library. Edited by Guy Ferrari. Vatican City, 1959.

Goldschmidt, Adolph with Kurt Weitzmann. Die byzantinischen Elfenbeinskulpturen des X-XIII Jahrhunderts. Berlin: Deutscher Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft, 1979 reprinted from B. Cassirer, 1930-34.

Grabar, André. "Quelques reliquaires de Saint Démétrios et le martyrium du saint à Salonique." DOP 5 (1950): 3-28.

Grassin, Geoffrey. "Le travail des gemmes au XIII^{e} siècle dans la Doctrina poliendi pretiosos lapides," Cahiers de civilisation médiévale 42 (1999): 111-137.

Grierson, Philip. Byzantine Coins. Berkeley: University of California, 1982.

Griffith, Sidney H. "Images, Islam and Christian Icons: A Moment in the Christian/Muslim Encounter in Early Islamic Times." In La Syrie de Byzance a l'Islam, VIIe – VIIIe siècles. Damascus: Institut Français, 1992: 121-138.

Grotowski, Piotr Ł. Arms and Armour of the Warrior Saints: Tradition and Innovation in Byzantine Iconography (843-1261). Translated by Richard Brzezinski. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Hall, Kenneth R. "International Trade and Foreign Diplomacy in Early Medieval Southern India." Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient 21/1 (Jan., 1978): 75-98.

Halleux, Robert and Paul Mayvaert, "Les origines de la mappae clavicula," Archives d'histoire docrtrinale et litteraire du Moyen-âge 54 (1987): 7-58.

Hamilton, Janet and Bernard Hamilton with Yuri Stoyanov. Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World, c. 650-c. 1450. Manchester UP, 1998.

Harrell, James A. et al. "The Ptolemaic to Early Roman Amethyst Quarry at Abu Diyeiba in Egypt's Eastern Desert." Bulletin de l'Institut français de archéologie orientale 106 (2006): 127-162.

Henig, Martin. The Content Family Collection of Ancient Cameos. Oxford, England: Ashmolean Museum, 1990.

Hjort, Øystein. "The Sculpture of Kariye Camii." DOP 33 (1979): 199-289.

Hoi pyles tou mysteriou: thesauroi tes Orthodoxias apo ten Hellada [The Gates of Mystery: Treasures of Orthodoxy from Greece]. Edited by Manoles Bormboudakes. Athens: Bastas-Plessas, 1994.

Hourani, George Fadlo. Arab Seafaring in the Indian Ocean in Ancient and Early Medieval Times. Edited by John Carswell. Princeton UP, 1995.

Hoyland, Robert G. Arabia and the Arabs: From the Bronze Age to the Coming of Islam. London: Routledge, 2001.

Il Menologio di Basilio II (cod. Vaticano Greco 1613). Turin: Fratelli Bocca, 1907.

Iskusstvo Vizantii v sobraniiakh SSSR [Art of Byzantium in Collections of the USSR]. Edited by Alice V. Bank. Moscow: Sovietskii khudozhnik, 1977.

James, Liz. "Pray Not to Fall into Temptation and Be on Your Guard': Pagan Statues in Christian Constantinople." Gesta 35/1 (1996): 12-20.

Jensen, Robin. Understanding Early Christian Art. London: Routledge, 2000.

Jülich, Theo. "Gemmenkreuze: Die Farbigkeit ihres Edelsteinbesatzes bis zum 12. Jahrhundert." Aachener Kunstblätter 54-55 (1986-87): 99-259.

Kahsnitz, Rainer. "Die Staufische Kameen." In Die Zeit der Staufer 5: Supplement. Würtembergisches Landesmuseum, 1977: 477-520.

Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, Ioli. Byzantione Icons in Steatite. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1985.

——. "The Cup of San Marco and the 'Classical' in Byzantium."In Studien zur mittelalterlichen Kunst, 800-1250: Festschrift für Florentine Mutherich zum 70. Geburtstag . Edited by Katharina Bierbrauer et al. Munich: Prestel, 1985: 167-174.

Kalopissi-Verti, Sophia. "The Proskynetaria of the Templon and Narthex: Form, Imagery, Spatial Connections, andReception." In Thresholds of the Sacred: Architectural, Art Historical, Liturgical, and Theological Perspectives on Religious Screans, East and West. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 2006: 107-132.

Kartsonis, Anna D. Anastasis: The Making of an Image. Princeton UP, 1986.

Katalog der Sammlung für Plastik und Kunstgewerbe 1: Mittelalter. Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum, 1964.

Klein, Holger A. editor. Sacred Gifts and Worldly Treasures. NY: Abrams, 2007.

Kitzinger, Ernst. "Reflections on the Feast Cycle in Byzantine Art." Cahiers Archéologiques 36 (1988): 51-73.

Kornbluth, Genevra. "'Early Byzantine' Crystals: An Assessment." Journal of the Walters Art Gallery 52/53 (1994/95): 23-32.

——. Engraved Gems of the Carolingian Empire. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1995.

Krug, Antje. "Antike Gemmen an mittelalterlichen Goldschmiedearbeiten im Kunstgewerbemuseum Berlin." Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen 37 (1995): 103-119.

——. "Antike Gemmen und das Zeitalter Bernwards." Bernward von Hildesheim und das Zeitalter der Ottonen: Katalog der Ausstellung. Edited by Michael Brandt and Arne Eggebrecht. Diözesanmuseum Hildesheim, 1993: 161-172.

Lafond, Jean. "Découverte de vitraux historiés du Moyen Age a Constantinople." Cahiers Archéologiques 18 (1968): 231-38.

Lange, Reinhold. Die byzantinische Reliefikone. Recklinghausen: Aurel Bongers, 1964.

Lemerle, Paul. Byzantine Humanism: The First Phase: notes and remarks on education and culture in Byzantium from its origins to the 10th century. Translated by Helen Lindsay and Ann Moffatt. Canberra: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1986.

Les objets byzantins et post-byzantins Edited by Coche de la Ferté et al., Vol. 2 of Collection Hélène Stathatos. Strasbourg, 1953.

Le Trésor de Saint-Denis: Musée du Louvre. Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 1991.

Lowden, John. The Octateuchs: A Study in Byzantine Manuscript Illumination. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State UP, 1992.

Maguire, Eunice Dauterman and Henry Maguire. Other Icons: Art and Power in Byzantine Secular Culture. Princeton UP, 2007.

Maguire, Henry. "The Art of Comparing in Byzantium," Art Bulletin 70/1 (Mar., 1988): 88-103.

——. "Style and Ideology in Byzantine Imperial Art." Gesta 28/2 (1989): 217-231.

——. "Garments Pleasing to God: The Significance of Domestic Textile Designs in the Early Byzantine Period," DOP 44 (1990): 215-224.

——. "Epigrams, Art, and the 'Macedonian Renaissance.'" DOP 48 (1994): 105-115.

——. Byzantine Magic. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 1995.

——. The Icons of their Bodies: Saints and their Images in Byzantium. Princeton UP, 1996.

——. "Observations on the icons of the west façade of San Marco, Venice." In Byzantine Icons: Art, Technique and Technology. Heraklion: Crete UP, 2002: 303-312.

——. "The Aniketos Icon and the Display of Relics in the Decoration of San Marco." In San Marco, Byzantium, and the Myths of Venice ed. Henry Maguire and Robert S. Nelson. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 2010: 91-111.

——. "Ivories as Pilgrimage Art: A New Frame for the 'Frame Group." DOP 61 (2009): 117-146.

Majeska, George. "A Medallion of the Prophet Daniel in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection." DOP 28 (1974): 361-366.

Mango, Cyril. "Antique Statuary and the Beholder." DOP 17 (1963): 53-75.

Mango, Cyril and Marlia Mundell. "Cameos in Byzantium." in Cameos in Context: The Benjamin Zucker Lectures, 1990. Edited by Martin Henig and Michael Vickers. Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1993: 57-76.

Marcos, Natalio Fernández. The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible. Leiden: Brill, 2000, 287-302.

Masterpieces in the Collection of Greek and Roman Antiquities 4: A Brief Guide to the Kunsthistorisches Museum. Edited by Wilfried Siepel. Milan: Skira, 2006.

Masterpieces of Byzantine Art. Edited by David Talbot Rice. Edinburgh: University Press, 1958.

Mateos, Juan. Le Typicon de la Grande *É*glise. 165-166: Orientalia Christiana Analecta. Rome: Pontificale Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1962-63.

——. La c*élé*bration de la parole dans la liturgie byzantine. 191: Orientalia Christiana Analecta. Rome: Pontificale Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1971.

Mathews, Thomas G. The Clash of the Gods. 2nd ed. Princeton UP, 1999.

Matthiae, Guglielmo. Le porte bronzee bizantine in Italia. Rome: Officina Edizioni Roma, 1971.

Megaw, Arthur H. S. "Notes on Recent Work of the Byzantine Institute in Istanbul." DOP 17 (1963): 333-371.

Meischner, Jutta. "Der Hochzeitskameo des Honorius." Archäologischer Anzeiger 4 (1993): 613-619.

Menis, Gian Carlo "Un malnoto cammeo cividalese con Daniele fra i leoni vestito alla persian.," Rivista di archeologia cristiana 49/2 (1973): 183-193.

Meyvaert, Paul. "Medieval Notions of Publication: The 'Unpublished' Opus Caroli regis contra synodum and the Council of Frankfort (794)." Journal of Medieval Latin 12 (2002): 78-98.

Moretti, Simona. Roma bizantina: Opere d'arte dall'impero di Costantinopoli nelle collezioni romane. Rome: Nuova Cultura, 2007.

Morgan, Charles H., II. "Excavations at Corinth, 1935-1936." American Journal of Archaeology 40/4 (1936): 466-484.

Möseneder, Karl. "Lapides vivi: Über die Kreuzkapelle der Burg Karlstein." Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft 34 (1981): 41-69.

Mouriki, Doula. "The Wall Paintings of the Church of the Panagia at Moutoullas, Cyprus." In Byzanz und der Westen: Studien zur Kunst des europäischen Mittelalters. Edited by Irmgard Hutter and Herbert Hunger. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1984: 171-214.

Museum of History and Art, Zagorsk. Leningrad: Aurora Art Publishers, 1986.

Myśliński, Michał. "Gemmy późnoantyczne i bizantyńskie w polskich kolecjach muzealnych." Biuletyn Historii Sztuki 2/2006: 229-233.

Nau, Elisabeth. "Meisterwerke staufischer Glyptik." Schwizerische numismatische Rundschau 45 (1966): 145-171.

——. "Staufer-Adler." Jahrbuch der staatlichen Kunstsammlungen in Baden-W*ürttemberg* 5 (1968): 21-56.

Nesbitt, John and Nicolas Oikonomides editors. Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1991.

Nicolle, David C. Early Medieval Islamic Arms and Armour. Gladius: Tomo Especial. Madrid: Instituto de estudios sobre armas antiguas, 1976.

——. Arms and Armour of the Crusading Era 1050-1350. White Plains, NY: Kraus International, 1988.

——. "Byzantine and Islamic Arms and Armour: Evidence for Mutual Influence." Graeco-Arabica 4 (1991): 299-325.

Nikolaeva, T. V. Drevneruskaia melkaia plastika, XI-XVI [Old Russian Minor Sculpture, 11th–16th c.]. Moscow: Sovetskii Khudozhnik, 1968.

Oakeshott, Ewart. Records of the Medieval Sword. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1991.

Objets sculptés d'art mineur en serbie ancienne. Edited by Bojana Radojkovic. Belgrade: Muzej Primenjene Umetnosti, 1977.

Oikonomides, Nicholas. "The Role of the Byzantine State in the Economy." Economic History of Byzantium: From the Seventh through the Fifteenth Century. Edited by Angeliki Laiou. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 2002: 973-1058.

Osharina, O. V. "Obraz sv. Daniila vo rvu l'vinom v vizantiiskom iskusstve pozdnekomninskogo vremeni [Image of St. Daniel in the Lions' Den in Byzantine Art of the Late Komenian Time]." In Vizantiiskaia ideia: Vizantiia v epokhu Komninov I Paleologov [The Byzantine Idea: Byzantium in the epoch of the Komnenoi and Paleologoi]. Edited by Vera N. Zalesskaia. St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennyi Ermitazh, 2006: 93-102.

Ousterhout, Robert. Master Builders of Byzantium. Princeton UP, 1999.

The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium 3 vols. Edited by Alexander P. Kazhdan. Oxford UP, 1991.

Paribeni, Andrea. "Materiali byzantini poco noti dei musei di Roma: Le paste vitree di Palazzo Venezia." Rivista dell'Istituto nazionale d'archeologia e storia dell'arte 57 (2002): 449-459.

Parani, Maria G. Reconstructing the Reality of Images: Byzantine Material Culture and Religious Iconography (11th-15th centuries) Vol. 41 of The Medieval Mediterranean, Peoples, Economies and Cultures, 400-1453. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

——. "Representations of Glass Objects as a Source on Byzantine Glass: How Useful are They?" DOP 59 (2005): 147-171.

Parpulov, Georgi Radomirov. Toward a History of Byzantine Psalters. Unpublished dissertation, Univeristy of Chicago, 2004.

Peers, Glenn. Subtle Bodies: Representing Angels in Byzantium. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Pentcheva, Bissera V. Icons and Power: The Mother of God in Byzantium. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 2006.

——. "The Performative Icon," Art Bulletin 88/4 (Dec., 2006): 631-655.

——. "Moving Eyes: Surface and shadow in the Byzantine mixed-media relief icon." Res 55-56 (Spring-Autumn, 2009): 222-34.

——. The Sensual Icon: Space, Ritual and the Senses in Byzantium. University Park: Penn State UP, 2010.

Piatnitsky, Yuri. "The Panagiarion of Alexios Komnenos Angelos and Middle Byzantine Painting." In Perceptions of Byzantium and Its Neighbors (843-1261) ed. Olenka Z. Pevny. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2000: 40-55.

Pitarakis, Brigitte. Les croix-reliquaires pectorales byzantines en bronze XVI: Bibliotheque des cahiers archéologiques. Paris: Picard, 2006.

Putzko, Wassilij. "Die zweiseitge Kamee in der Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore." In Beiträge zur Kunst des Mittelalters: Festschrift für Hans Wentzel zum 60. Geburtstag. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1975: 173-179

Ray, Himanshu P. The Winds of Change: Buddhism and the Maritime Links of Early South Asia. Delhi: Oxford UP, 1994.

Restle, Marcell. Byzantine Wall Painting 1: Text. Translated by Irene R. Gibbons. Greenwich, CT; Recklinghausen: New York Graphic Society; Aurel Bongers, 1967.

Rhighetti, Romolo. "Le Opere di glittica dei Musei Annessi alla Biblioteca Vaticana." Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia 28/3-4 (1955-56): 279-348.

Rodziewicz, Elizabeth. "Ivory, bone, glass, and other production at Alexandria, 5th–9th centuries." In Byzantine Trade, 4th–12th Centuries: The Archaeology of Local, Regional and International Exchange Edited by Marlia Mundell Mango. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2009: 89-95.

Rom und Byzanz: Schatzkammerstücke aus bayerischen Sammlungen. Edited by Reinhold Baumstark et al. Munich: Hirmer Vlg., 1998.

Ross, Marvin C. ed. Catalogue of the Byzantine and Early Mediaeval Antiquities in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection. 2nd ed. edited by Susan A. Boyd and Stephen R. Zwirn. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 2005.

Ross, Marvin C. and Basil Laourdas. "The Pendant Jewel of the Metropolitan Arsenius." in Essays in Honor of Georg Swarzenski . Chicago: Charles Regnery, 1951: 181-184.

Rybakov, Boris A. Russkie datirovannye nadpisi XI-XIV [Dated Russian Epigraphs 11th-14th c.]. Moscow: Nauk, 1964.

Sacred Art, Secular Context. Edited by Asen Kirin. Athens, GA: Georgia Museum of Art, 2005.

Sacred Arts and City Life: The Glory of Medieval Novgorod Edited by Yevgenia Petrova. St. Petersburg: Palace Editions, 2005.

Sahas, Daniel. Icon and Logos: Sources in Eighth-Century Iconoclasm. U of Toronto, 1986.

Sanders, Guy D. R. "Recent Developments in the Chronology of Byzantine Corinth." Corinth 20: Corinth, The Centenary: 1896-1996 (2003): 385-399.

Šandrovskaja, Valentina S. and Werner Seibt with Natascha Seibt. Byzantinische Bleisiegel der Staatlichen Eremitage mit Familiennamen. Volume 1: Sammlung Lichačev – Namen von A bis I. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005.

Santangelo, Antonino editor. Cividale vol. 10 in Catalogo delle cose d'arte e di antichita d'Italia. Rome: La Libreria dello Stato, 1936.

Saradi-Mendelovici, Helen. "Christian Attitudes toward Pagan Monuments in Late Antiquity and their Legacy in Later Byzantine Centuries." DOP 44 (1990): 47-61.

Saunders, Ernest W. "Theophylact of Bulgaria as Writer and Biblical Interpreter." Biblical Research 2 (1957): 31-44.

Schafer, Edward H. The golden Peaches of Samarkand: A Study of T'ang Exotics. Berkeley: University of California, 1963.

Schiller, Gertrud. Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst. Vol. 1, Inkarnation-Kindheit-Taufe-Versuchung-Verklärung-Wirken und Wunder Christi. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Ver. Gerd Mohn, 1966.

Schlumberger, Gustave. Sigillographie de l'Orient latin. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1943.

Schroeder, Rossitza B. "Images of Christ Emmanuel in Karanlik Kilise." Studies in Iconography 29 (2008): 23-54.

Šedinová, Hana. "The Symbolism of the Precious Stones in St. Wenceslas Chapel." Artibus et Historiae 20/39 (1999): 75-94.

Sena Chiesa, Gemma. "La 'Croce di Desiderio' a Brescia ed il problema del riuso glittico in età tardoantica ed altomedievale." In Splendida Civitas Nostra: Studi archeologici in onore di Antonio Frova. Edited by G. Cavalieri Manasse and E. Roffia. Rome: Quasar, 1995): 429-441.

——. Gemme dalla corte imperiale alla corte celeste. Milan: Università degli studi di Milano, 2002.

Ševčenko, Nancy Patterson. Illustrated Manuscripts of the Metaphrastian Menologion. U of Chicago, 1990.

Sidebotham, Steven E., Martin Hense and Hendrikje M. Nouwens. The Red Land. American University of Cairo, 2007.

Sinai, Byzantium, Russia: Orthodox Art from the Sixth to the Twentieth Century. Edited by Yuri Piatnitsky et al. St. Petersburg: State Hermitage Museum, 2000.

Slane, Kathleen Warner. "Observations on Mediterranean Amphoras and Tablewares Found in India." In Rome and India: The Ancient Sea Trade. Edited by Vimala Begley and Richard Daniel De Puma. Madison, WI: U of Wisconsin, 1991: 204-215.

Spätantike und frühes Christentum eds. H. Beck and P.C. Bol. Frankfurt am Main: Museum alter Plastik, 1983.

Speck, Paul. "Ikonoklasmus und die Anfänge der makedonischen Renaissance." Poikila Byzantina 4 (1984): 175-210.

Spier, Jeffrey. "Medieval Byzantine Magical Amulets and Their Tradition." Journal of the Warburg & Courtauld Institute 56 (1993): 25-62.

——. "Middle Byzantine (10th - 13th AD) Stamp Seals in Semi-Precious Stone." in Through a Glass Brightly: Studies in Byzantine and Medieval Art and Archaeology Presented to David Buckton. Edited by Chris Entwistle. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2003: 114-126.

——. Late Antique and Early Christian Gems. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2007.

Staab, Karl. Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche. Münster: Aschendorff, repr. 1984.

Sterligova, Irina A. "Maloizvestnye proizvedeniia srednevisantiiskoi gliptiki v museiakh Mosckovskogo Kremlia [Little Known Works of Middle Byzantine Glyptic in Museums of the Moscow Kremlin]." In Vizantiiskaia ideia: Vizantiia v epokhu Komninov I Paleologov [The Byzantine Idea: Byzantium in the epoch of the Komnenoi and Paleologoi]. Edited by Vera N. Zalesskaia. St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennyi Ermitazh, 2006: 180-186.

Stern, Henri. "Pieresc et le Grand Camée de France." La Revue des arts 6 (1956): 255-256.

Talbot, Alice-Mary. "Evidence about Glass in Medieval Greek Texts from the Eighth to the Fifteenth Century." DOP 59 (2005): 141-145.

Touwaide, Alain. "Arabic Materia Medica in Byzantium during the 11th century A.D. and the Problems of Transfer of Knowledge in Medical Science." In Science and Technology in the Islamic World 21 (2002): 223-246.

——. "Byzantine Hospital Manuals (Iatrosophia) as a Source for the Study of Therapeutics." In The Medieval Hospital and Medical Practice. Edited by Barbara S. Bowers. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007: 147-173.

Transition to Christianity: Art of Late Antiquity, 3rd-7th Century AD. Edited by Anastasia Lazaridou. NY: Alexander S. Onassis Public Benefit Association, 2012.

Treasures of Mount Athos. Edited by Athanasios A. Karakatsanis and Basile Atsalos. Thessaloniki: Museum of Byzantine Culture, 1997.

Verità, Marco and Tullio Toninato. "A comparative analytical investigation on the origins of the Venetian glassmaking." Rivista della Stazione sperimentale del vetro 20 (1990): 169-176.

Vickers, Michael. "A Note on Glass Medallions in Oxford." Journal of Glass Studies 16 (1974): 18-21.

Vikan, Gary. "Art, Medicine and Magic in Early Byzantium." DOP 38 (1984): 65-86.

——. "Art and Marriage in Early Byzantium." DOP 44 (1990): 145-163.

Volbach, Wolfgang Friedrich. Mittelalterliche Bildwerke aus Italien und Byzanz 2nd ed. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1930.

Von Saldern, Axel. Ancient and Byzantine Glass from Sardis. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1980.

Vorontsova, L. M. "Vizantiiskie kamei iz riznitsy Troitse-Sergievoi lavry [Byzantine Cameos from an Icon Revetment of the Trinity-Sergius Lavra]." In Vizantiiskaia ideia: Vizantiia v epokhu Komninov I Paleologov [The Byzantine Idea: Byzantium in the Epoch of the Komnenoi and Paleologoi]. Edited by Vera N. Zalesskaia. St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennyi Ermitazh, 2006: 11-31.

Walter, Christopher. "'Latter-Day' Saints in the Model for the London and Barberini Psalters." Revue des Études Byzantines 46 (1988): 211-228.

——. The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

Weinberg, Gladys Davidson. "A Medieval Mystery: Byzantine Glass Production." Journal of Glass Studies 17 (1975): 127-140.

Weitzmann, Kurt. "Der Pariser Psalter Ms. 139 und die mittelbyzantinische Renaissance." Jahrbuch fur Kunstwissenschaft 6 N.S. (1939): 178-194.

——. "The Character and Intellectual Origins of the Macedonian Renaissance." In Studies in Classical and Byzantine Manuscript Illumination. Edited by Herbert L. Kessler. U of Chicago, 1971: 176-184. Translation of "Geistige Grundlagen und Wesen der Makedonischen Renaissance." In Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen 107. Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1963.

Weitzmann, Kurt. The Monastery of Saint Catherine at Mount Sinai, the icons. Princeton UP, 1976.

Weitzmann, Kurt and Massimo Bernabò. The Byzantine Octateuchs. Princeton UP, 1999.

Wentzel, Hans. "Mittelalterliche Gemmen: Versuch einer Grundlegung." Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft 8 (1941): 45-98.

——. "Mittelalter und Antike im Spiegel kleiner Kunstwerke des 13. Jahrhunderts," in Studier tillägnade Henrik Cornell på sextioårsdagen (Stockholm, 1950): 67-93.

——. "Mittelalterliche Gemmen am Oberrhein und verwandte Arbeiten." In Form und Inhalt: Kunstgeschichtliche Studien, Otto Schmitt zum 60. Geburtstag am 13. Dezember 1950 dargebracht von seinen Freunden. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1950: 145-158

——. "Portraits 'á l'antique' on French Mediaeval Gems and Seals." Translated by Charles Mitchell. Journal of the Warburg & Courtauld Institutes 16/3-4 (1953): 342-50.

——. "Die vier Kameen im aachener Domschatz und die französische Gemmenschneidekunst des 13. Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift für Kunstwissenschaft* 8/1-2 (1954): 1-18.

——. "Mittelalterliche Gemmen in den Sammlungen Italiens," Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorisches Intstitutes in Florenz 7/3-4 (Jul., 1957): 239-278.

——. "Das Medaillon mit dem Hl. Theodor und die venezianischen Glaspasten im byzantinischen Stil." Festschrift für Erich Meyer zum sechzigsten Geburtstag 29. Oktober 1957. Hamburg: Hauswedell Verl., 1959: 50-67.

——. "Datierte und datierbare byzantinische Kameen." In Festschrift Friedrich Winkler Edited by Hans Möhle. Berlin: Verl. Gebr. Mann, 1959: 9-21.

——. "Die byzantinischen Kameen in Kassel: Zur Problematik der Datierung byzantinischer Gemmen." In Mouseion: Studien aus Kunstgeschichte für Otto H. Foster Edited by Heinz Ladendorf and Horst Vey. Cologne: M. DuMont Schauberg, 1960: 88-96.

——. "'Staatskameen' im Mittelalter," Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen 4 (1962): 42-77.

——. "Die Kamee der Kaiserin Anna: zur Datierung byzantinisierender Intaglien." In Festschrift Ulrich Middeldorf. Edited by Antje Kosegarten and Peter Tigler. Berlin, 1968: 1-11.

——. "Der Bergkristall mit der Geschichte der Susanna." Pantheon 28 (1970): 365-372.

Whitehouse, David. "The date of the 'Agora South Centre' workshop at Corinth." Archeologia medievale 20 (1993): 659-662.

——. "Byzantine Gilded Glass." In Gilded and Enamelled Glass from the Middle East edited by Rachel Ward. London: British Museum, 1998: 4-7.

Wibiral, Norbert. "Augustus patrem figurat: Zu den Betrachtungsweisen des Zentralsteines am Lotharkreuz im Domschatz zu Aachen." Aachener Kunstblätter 60 (1994): 105-30.

Williamson, Paul. "Daniel between the lions: a new sardonyx cameo for the British Museum." Jewellry Studies 1 (1983): 37-39.

Woodfin, Warren T. "An Officer and a Gentleman: Transformations in the Iconography of a Warrior Saint." DOP 60 (2006): 111-143.

Wright, David H. "The Date of the Vatican Illuminated Handy Tables of Ptolemy and its Early Additions." Byzantinische Zeitschrift 78/2 (1985): 355-62.

Young, Frances. Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture. Cambridge UP, 1996.

Zacos, George. Byzantine Lead Seals vol. 2. Compiled and edited by John W. Nesbitt. Bern: Benteli, 1984.

Zalizniak, Andrei A. Drevnenovgorodskii dialekt. 2nd edition revised and expanded. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoi kul'tury, 2004.

Zchomelidse, Nino. "Amore virginis und honore patriae – Die Rufolo Kanzel im Dom von Ravello." Analecta Romana Instituti Danici 26 (1999): 100-102.

——. "Allegory and Remembrance: Lay Patronage in the Angevin Kingdom," in Art, Ritual , and Civic Identity in Medieval Southern Italy. State College: Pennsylvania State UP, 2014.

Zecchin, Luigi.Vetro e vetrai di Murano: studi sulla storia del vetro. Venice: Arsenale, 1987.

Zwierlein-Diehl, Erika. "'Interpretatio christiana': Gems on the Shrine of the Three Kings in Cologne." In Engraved Gems: Survivals and Revivals. Edited by Clifford Malcolm Brown. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1997: 62-83.

——. Antike Gemmen und ihr Nachleben. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.

James A. Magruder, III

James .Magruder@jhu.edu
Doctoral Candidate
History of Art
Johns Hopkins University

Education

2014 Ph.D. Johns Hopkins University. Baltimore, MD
Specialization in Early Christian & Byzantine art
Dissertation: Byzantine Cameos and the Aesthetics of the Icon

2003 M.Div. St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary. Crestwood, NY
Degree in Eastern Orthodox theology magna cum laude
Thesis: The Sinope Gospels: An Illuminated Gospel Book as Anti-Chalcedonian Polemic

1992 B.A. Grinnell College. Grinnell, IA
Degree in Russian language and literature with honors

Employment

1997-2000 Network Administrator. Des Moines University. Des Moines, IA.
Managed academic network for health sciences university. Assisted with network planning and budgeting.

1995-1997 Clinical Evaluations Coordinator. Des Moines University. Des Moines, IA.
Managed clinical evaluations for medical students on rotations. Programmed and administered evaluations database. Prepared Dean's analysis of clinical sites.

Teaching Assistantships

Introduction to the History of Art, Ancient to Medieval
Early Christian Art
Biblical Narrative in the Middle Ages
Introduction to Romanesque Architecture
Introduction to the History of Art, Renaissance to Modern
British and American Architecture to the Civil War
French Painting of the 19th Century
Abstract Expressionism

Awards

2009 Sadie and Louis Roth Fellowship
2007 Hodson Fellowship

Lectures

2009 "Counterfeiting Romanitas in Late Byzantine and Medieval Cameos." Gradua Student Conference. 7Th Bienniel Bryn Mawr College Graduate Group Symposium. Bryn Mawr, PA. December 4-5, 2009.

2008 Invited lecture but unable to present due to personal circumstances. Spring Graduate Student Symposium. Philadelphia Museum of Art. April 4-5, 2008.